

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 1900.

The Week.

On Monday Mr. Roosevelt forgot for a moment the need of more battleships to put in a plea for additional coast defences. Our growing wealth, he explains, makes us really a more and more attractive morsel for foreign nations. There is so much money stored away in our insurance and safety-deposit vaults that some foreign "gobble-un" will certainly get us if we "don't watch out." Fifty millions is the modest sum required to complete in a modernized manner the fortifications projected by the Endicott Board, which have already cost more than a hundred millions. And then there are the insular possessions for whose fortification we are to spend nineteen millions, unless we desire Japan to gobble the Philippines, and England to pounce down on Porto Rico without a moment's notice. Guantánamo, San Juan, Guam, Subig Bay, Manila Bay, Pearl Harbor, and Honolulu are all eligible places in which to sink good money, while to fortify Panama will take five millions. These are some items in Imperialism's little bill Mr. Roosevelt would have us pay. And the worst of it is, as the President admits, the fashions in coast artillery change so rapidly that what is an enormously costly and valuable machinery to-day goes to the junk-heap to-morrow.

All the miserable calculations about how many wretched dollars our tobacco and sugar Senators have saved for their constituents by killing the Philippine bill, are quite beside the mark. Nor is it a question merely of one more Administration measure being slaughtered in the house of its friends. Beyond all these mercenary and political considerations rises the fact that the nation's good faith has been aspersed. There is involved a large matter of public policy, and not, as Senators pettifogging in behalf of their "interests" allege, merely a dispute over tariff schedules. We do not know, and we do not greatly care, whether the adoption of the reduced tariff rates proposed, with free trade three years from now, would enable the Filipinos to make a better living than they can to-day. That is not the real point. The true issue is one of sentiment rather than of trade. By the pledges of our Government, by the personal attitude of Secretary Taft and President Roosevelt, by the urgings of one Governor-General after another and the entire Philippine Commission, the Filipinos had come to think of the bill

which the Senate committee throttled on Friday, as a crucial test of the generosity and sincerity of this country. Now they see all their hopes cast down. It is necessary to turn only to the warnings of Secretary Taft to understand how calamitous the effect upon them will be.

Secretary Taft made an important admission at last week's hearing before the Senate Philippines Committee. Hitherto he has insisted that only a few Filipino demagogues and hotheads desired independence. Now he states that a majority of the intelligent Filipinos are for absolute independence, and he would have been within the bounds of the truth if he had added that they want it right away and are as anxious as possible to get the Americans out of the islands. The Secretary, according to one report, then kindly explained that they were "a sentimental people, and that the ideals of independence appeal to them generally and unconditionally"—much, apparently, as they appealed to Patrick Henry, Benjamin Franklin, and a few other American sentimentalists. But Mr. Taft had his warning ready. Without the restraining power of the United States, there would be a reproduction of revolutionary conditions similar to those in South American republics. For that reason the United States, apparently, must continue to do policeman's work among a people who hate and despise us—and at a terrible cost. Senator Hale declared that every American soldier who goes to the Philippines "comes back a physical wreck." The Secretary felt that health conditions there were about the same as in the Southern States, and added that the ill-health of our soldiers was largely due to the drink habit, which is increased by lack of diversion. Surely, an admirable example for the temperate Filipinos! Thus, little by little, do a few truths about the situation in the Philippines leak out. It is admitted, for instance, that the United States does not dare to decrease its present regular-army garrison in the Philippines by more than 5,000 men, in the event of hostilities with China.

Senator Bailey, as a brother-lawyer admiring Mr. Foraker's constitutional argument, is reported to have said: "If that speech cannot be answered, the Hepburn bill ought not to pass." Very likely the Texas Senator believes that he himself can answer it. But there is one part of it which devolves upon the Administration to answer, if it is able. Senator Foraker charged in the most explicit fashion that there has

been "no serious attempt" by the Government to enforce the existing law against railway rebates and discriminations. After reciting the drastic provisions of the Elkins act of 1903, which the President at that time stated was all he wanted, the Ohio Senator declared that they had not been invoked as they should have been by the Department of Justice; and concluded that "the fault is not with the existing law, but with the officials who have not enforced it." It would be interesting to hear what the Attorney-General, by direction of the President, might have to say to this. His answer could scarcely be that he was so anxious for a new law that he forgot to exhaust the possibilities of the old.

The movement for consular reform, which was launched during the present session of Congress with high hopes, will clearly need the most earnest support of all its friends. It is one thing for a Congressman or a Senator to express benevolent intentions towards the merit system; it is quite another for him to vote to reduce the consular patronage by a whit. Accordingly, all persons concerned either in the extension of our foreign commerce or in the betterment of our consular system should note the call for a national consular-reform convention to be held at Washington on the 13th and following days of this month. All chambers of commerce, boards of trade, mercantile exchanges, and similar organizations are invited to send accredited delegates. The purpose of the convention will be to effect a permanent national organization, and to keep the cause constantly before Congress. That there is need of such combined effort needs no argument when Congressional committees are industriously engaged in amending nearly all the merit out of the bill which Secretary Root has been urging.

The action of the House Agricultural Committee in eliminating the free-seed item from the regular appropriation bill at least shifts the burden of proof to the advocates of this expenditure. Formerly it was the opponents who had to propose amending the bill, and they were invariably unsuccessful. Fondness for the free-seed distribution is not altogether an unamiable weakness on the part of our lawmakers. Like Sam Weller's crumpets, garden seeds are "so cheap and so very fillin' at the price." In no other way could the members make little presents to so many constituents with so small a drain upon the Treasury. Of course, the pretence that the practice circulated new and val-

uable varieties of plants in new localities has been pretty largely abandoned. The greater part of the seeds now sent out under the frank have, in fact, been bought by the Government from ordinary commercial seed firms. So far as the distribution is legitimate at all—as it may be in the case of varieties introduced or developed by the Government itself—the Department of Agriculture can attend to it very much more efficiently than Congress.

At a meeting of the Commercial Club of Springfield, O., the recent scene of mob violence and incendiarism against the negro quarter—a meeting attended by the most prominent citizens of the city—it was stated that “the present conditions were due to politicians catering to negroes and low whites, and to the lax police and court methods.” This is the reason for nine-tenths of the racial outbreaks the country over. A few years ago we called attention to a number of horrible burnings and inexcusable lynchings near Wetumpka, Alabama. For a time no one paid any attention to them. There was no State constabulary, no local police, and the sheriff was indifferent. But a new sheriff came in who saw that the whites were being degraded by this state of affairs quite as much as the blacks. So he organized a posse and cleaned up the county, sending several white men to the chain gang, and in all driving a round dozen of the offenders out of the county, which has been well-behaved ever since. Professor Royce of Harvard, in a recent address in this city, affirmed from his own study of the question in Jamaica, that the whole negro problem is nine-tenths or more a question of administration. Bad government is responsible for the outbreaks in Springfield, O., in Danville, Ill., in Mississippi, and for the two riots of recent years in this city.

In nominating candidates for Aldermen to be voted on in the April election, Chicago has made its first test of the new Illinois primary law. The result seems to bear out the claims made by its supporters. Not only was there an unusually heavy vote polled by both parties, but the candidates recommended by the Municipal Voters' League were, in all but two instances, successful. In only one ward, the Fifth, was the result undecided; Alderman McCormick and Patrick Carroll, a saloonkeeper, dividing the delegates to the convention exactly. Coming at this juncture, the primary was unusually crucial. In many wards the chief issue was between the high-license and the low-license elements. Chicago's liquor interests, naturally, do not want the saloon license fee raised from \$500 to \$1,000 a year, and in the wards where that ques-

tion was raised the fight was bitter. In all, seventeen contests were made in the thirty-five wards. In eleven the issue was definite between the good-government forces and the saloons, and in three other cases there was a choice indicated by the reformers. Nine out of the eleven candidates endorsed by the reformers secured the delegates, and the three “preferred” candidates won.

We think the indignation of the investment community over the manner in which the “traction merger” promoters are treating shareholders, is altogether justified. The dealing with the street-railway investors, in particular, is not far from outright effrontery. The climax is the circular of disinterested advice to Metropolitan Street Railway shareholders, published on February 27 under the signature of three Wall Street Stock Exchange houses. This advice, the signatories declare, is given at the request of the company—“company” evidently meaning the officers who are endeavoring, through the merger, to void the lease of the street-railway system with its 7 per cent. dividend guarantee. This lease, it will be recalled, was the contract closed triumphantly by these very same “insiders” five years ago as a result of the meeting when street-railway shareholders were insolently bidden to “vote for the proposition first and discuss it afterward.” The New York City Railway, which thereupon leased the surface lines, and the Metropolitan Securities, which owned the New York City Railway, went into the “deal” with open eyes. Their own lawyers averred in court, in April, 1902, that the 7 per cent. dividend guaranteed on Metropolitan Street Railway was a rental which the property “did not earn last year, does not now earn, and cannot earn for some years.” This was their ground for asking the court not to interfere with the lease, since the facts, they urged, showed the good faith of the contractors. The lawyers' prediction has been verified; the 7 per cent. has not been earned, and the promoters of the scheme of 1902 are now laboring to break the lease and reduce the guarantee, through the subterfuge of the “traction merger.”

This was a situation calling for the utmost candor. It was incumbent on “insiders,” asking surrender of contract rights by the shareholders, to tell them what their company's earnings, assets, and liabilities actually were, and why the financiers who were so eager to pay and to keep on paying an unearned dividend, five years ago, are so alarmed at the prospect now. They have never given this information. Their call for assents of shareholders to the merger stated no particulars; it insisted on blind acquiescence. Finding the share-

holders properly resentful of such disingenuous behavior, the same people induce respectable Wall Street houses to look over the company's accounts and publicly give judgment as to the property's deplorable condition. The same thing was done with holders of Metropolitan Securities; in that case a bankers' committee declared that the accounts “are so complicated that it is difficult to gain a clear idea of the financial situation.” In advising surrender of the street-railway stock, the present committee remarks that “deficits will be so large as to seriously tax the resources of the lessee.” In other words, because the man who insisted on paying a fixed lease for my property, and who would not listen to my objections to the lease, now finds the payment inconvenient, I must reduce the rent. We express no opinion as to the financial condition of the street-railway property. It may be fully as bad as friends of the merger are trying to make out. If it is, however, we submit that the people who have been managing the property since 1902 ought to render a prompt and full account of their stewardship.

Justice Deuel on Thursday accepted service of papers which mark the beginning of the effort to free the bench from his presence. He expressed himself as ready to join issue, and in nowise averse to the publication of the charges. If his attitude means a readiness to have the question of his fitness passed upon by his judicial superiors without delay, it is to be commended. Unless he is absolutely hardened, his present position must be extremely painful. Indeed, had he a delicate and sensitive nature like Mr. McCurdy's, the Justice would probably now be on the high seas or strolling the boulevards with James Hazen Hyde, instead of resuming his seat on the bench. His accusers have not stopped with a recital of his technical violation of the law by accepting other employment, but have boldly charged him with blackmailing—which is the proper designation of his activities in connection with *Town Topics*. The bench cannot be rid of him too quickly; its whole tone is lowered as long as he wears the ermine. If he were guilty of nothing else than aiding Col. Mann by reading the proofs of his filthy sheet, Justice Deuel would have shown that his moral fibre has been as completely eaten away as that of many a poor wretch whom he himself has sent to reformatory, workhouse, or jail.

The unimpeachable advice regarding fair play and the evils of athletic proslutry which Coach Reid of Harvard uttered recently before the Vermont University Alumni, is hardly so interesting or important as the confession which he made incidentally as to the

practices in which he himself has indulged. Deprecating the "encouraging of good athletes coming to Harvard for the sake of the athletic reputation of the institution," he proceeded to give as an example the case of a young Western athlete whom he brought on in order to have his services on the team, paying not only his travelling expenses, but practically his entire tuition and living expenses at the university. It was "with the approval of the athletic committee"—and this at Harvard, which has posed as the champion of pure athletics! Mr. Reid passes no harsher judgment on this than to call it professionalism, "in intent at least." Yet that very thing is the gravest evil of present-day athletics, and, if Mr. Reid has been correctly quoted, his was a barefaced case of hiring. There is no mention of cigarette agency, score-card concession, or even stewardship of a boarding-club. The fact is, that it has not been possible for any institution to join in the ugly scramble of present-day athletics without becoming itself corrupted. As the revelations are extended to take in one after another of the colleges which once boasted of athletic purity, it becomes more and more evident that this is no question of local symptoms, but of underlying and general causes that demand radical treatment.

There are two startling announcements in the annual statement of the First Lord of the British Admiralty published on February 28. After proposing to begin in the coming financial year four armored vessels and seventeen destroyers, the First Lord adds that it has been decided to adopt turbine machinery for all of them. It would appear that the victory of the turbine over the reciprocating engine is nearly complete, for the English navy sets the pace for the rest of the world. Our own Navy Department has finally decided to equip two or three of its new vessels with the turbine, but it is characteristic of the British Admiralty that, when it goes in for a new device, it goes in whole-souled. Sometimes, as in the case of the submarine, it is a long time in making up its mind, but the large number of these boats now built or being constructed—fifty-one—shows how thoroughly it intends to protect its coasts with this craft. The United States, on the other hand, is neglecting its torpedo work in comparison with other countries, and the Holland boat scandal has stopped all submarine construction. America being so great a producer of oil, one would expect the Washington officials to be the first to announce a determination largely to use oil for fuel. But this is the First Lord's second sensational statement: oil installations are to be made on all new ves-

sels, and some of the older battleships are to be refitted with an oil-burning apparatus. For one thing, this must mean the storing of an enormous oil reserve in England for use in wartime.

It appears that the earliest dispatches gave a somewhat misleading account of John Morley's reversal of Gen. Kitchener's policy in Indian military administration. The new Secretary for India left it in no doubt, when a member of the Opposition, that he was in sympathy with Lord Curzon's protests against the attempt to deprive the civil government of India of full control over the military. On that issue, Curzon resigned as Viceroy; and it was naturally expected that Mr. Morley would take steps to restore matters to their former status. It was at first reported that he had done so fully, but it seems that the Secretary's action is in the nature of a compromise. In view of the fact that the new viceroy, Lord Minto, is quite content to let Kitchener have his head, the home Government could not very well order him to assert himself as Lord Curzon did until he was thrown over by Balfour. Accordingly, the decision was simply to strengthen as much as possible the powers of the military secretary in the Indian Council, thus enabling him to resist the commander-in-chief if he wishes to do so. Doubtless, Mr. Morley would have wished to go further; but he needed only to look into his own book on compromise to discover how necessary it sometimes is for a public man to accept accomplished facts and be guided by the combined wisdom of the Cabinet of which he is a member. Meanwhile, the struggle for the full supremacy of civil rule in India has been postponed.

The Rouvier Cabinet met a severe check on a military vote last week. The Socialists had determined to cut the annual training of the reservists and territorial troops in two, and they carried their motion by a plurality of seventy, in the face of the arguments of the Minister of War. But the Ministry had declined to make the vote a matter of confidence, and will not resign. To reduce the drilling time of the two classes of reserves to a mere fortnight and a week, respectively, would be to deviate markedly from the Continental standard of military efficiency. The fact that the French Socialists have taken so advanced a step in an anti-military direction at the very moment when war rumors abound, shows how strongly the anti-military reaction is working. Evidently the time has passed when France is longing for "a man on horseback" and the costly glories of war. The rebuff to the Ministry is an indication as well that the strict discipline by which the Radical-Socialist "bloc"

has been held together is relaxing. Long ago M. Jaurès became a dissident, and apparently a large body of the Socialists is held to the Government by a very slender bond. One may imagine that the old-age pension bill was rather hurriedly introduced to warm up a cooling alliance; if so, the military vote shows that the expedient has not provided the requisite measure of *rechauffage*.

If France is subject to a certain suspicion and handicap in all the parleying about Morocco, the fault is that of the exclusive protectionist policy which she has pursued in Madagascar and elsewhere. Should the negotiations take a turn looking to French control and final absorption of Morocco, there would be need of very explicit stipulations guaranteeing the open door. Of course, both Germany and France say they are ready to promise that; but it will be remembered that Lord Salisbury thought he had a similar pledge respecting Madagascar, though the French Foreign Minister, M. Hanotaux, found a means of evading it. It has unfortunately been the fact that international merchants have come to regard territory annexed by France as practically shut up to all but French trade. We have heard one large shipper say that an island or province with the tricolor over it might as well be sponged from the map, so far as equal privileges of trade are concerned. The same might be said of the American flag; and it does not lie in our mouths to reproach the French protectionists and colonial exploiters. We merely remark that they inevitably incline people to suspect their country, as ours do the United States, in international arrangements affecting trade.

The Czar's declaration concerning the functions of the Duma is, so far as it goes, reassuring. It promises for the popular assembly the usual legislative powers, where these do not conflict with the Imperial prerogative. In all but dynastic matters, the Duma is to have the attributes of a parliament. If this statement could be taken literally, it would indicate that the Czar has accepted the Liberal programme *in toto*. So bold and sagacious an act could hardly fail to check popular discontent and divert the reform movement into loyal channels. But, unhappily, former statements of the Tsar have been subject to perverse interpretation, or even to sudden reversal, and the worth of the present promise depends clearly upon the practical fulfilment of it when the Duma meets. In the intervening weeks much may happen to change the Tsar's generous sentiments. Meanwhile, the mere admission of the idea of a responsible parliament by a Romanoff has a considerable value.

THE SENATOR AND THE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT.

Senator Foraker closed his speech on the railway-rate bill on February 28 with a frank statement of the personal difficulty in which he found himself. He disliked exceedingly to differ with the President. To put himself at variance with party colleagues was also distasteful. He knew, too, that he should be "arraigned before the country by unfriendly critics as prompted by unworthy motives." But, he added:

"No man who allows himself to be controlled against his judgment by considerations of this character can do his duty or maintain his self-respect, or be entitled to retain the respect and confidence of his colleagues and constituents. If we enact this measure and it proves disappointing, as I believe it will, the people will not hear us to say in our defence that we legislated in response to their demands. They expect their representatives, especially in this body, with respect to questions of this character, to act intelligently, patriotically, and in accordance with their judgment and their oath of office, which binds them to disregard public clamor and legislate for the public welfare as they see and understand it."

Saying nothing for the moment of the merits of Mr. Foraker's argument against the Hepburn bill—though all agree that it was powerful—his statement of the duty of a public man to follow the light within his own breast cannot be controverted. It is, however, all the more notable, as coming from a politician, because we have lately had the contrary view upheld by a scholar in politics. President Hadley of Yale University published on February 24 an article on the Hepburn bill, attacking it, in his capacity as a railway expert, as severely as Senator Foraker does in the guise of a lawyer. Yet he wound up by saying that he felt it his duty, as he believed it the duty of Congress, to waive all individual convictions, and accept the Hepburn bill unamended, simply because the country is "in the midst of a great wave of moral sentiment," and it is better to "acquiesce in a measure" which the President approves.

To show how solid is the conviction which President Hadley builds up in order to swallow, we will quote a few of his characterizations of the Hepburn bill. Practically, and judging by English experience as well as our own, he thinks there is "reason to fear that this plan will not work." "I believe that evil and not good will come of the Hepburn bill." "If anybody is much harmed by illusory attempts to limit rights of appeal, it will be the shippers." "The combination of these three functions [advisory, prosecuting, and judicial] in one office is repugnant to the Constitution of the United States, to common law, and to the American sense of fair play." "I cannot concur with the President in believing that the Interstate Commerce Commission is the proper body for judicial determination of rates."

There is much more of this, but at the end we get the great act of faith which leads President Hadley to conclude: "The position of many of the Senators and Representatives that they will stand for a bill which has the approval of the President, and not for one which fails to have his approval, is in my judgment a wise one."

We should hate to see the freshman class in logic set to explaining these exertations of the Yale president. "Let us follow the argument," Socrates was wont to say; but President Hadley's exemplar is apparently that old English divine who thought any logic "wicked" which did not, whatever the premises, make the praise and glory of God come out in the conclusion. But the matter goes deeper than perversity of reasoning. What is to become of us if our leaders of thought deliberately advocate surrendering to what they believe a passing craze? How are we ever going to get wise and matured legislation if the men who clearly point out, as President Hadley does, that the Hepburn bill is "based on bad principles," are yet ready to consent to what they describe as a great evil merely because not to surrender would engender a "spirit of distrust and class antagonism"? Such an attitude as that of President Hadley's is not simply one impossible to defend in itself: it directly invites public evils to which the evils which he foresees from the Hepburn bill are as the small dust in the balance. All that any demagogue would need to do would be to threaten "deep-seated misunderstandings" and "bitter class struggles," in case any nostrum of his were not accepted, and the men of intelligence and character would have to yield in terror. Where can the line be drawn? If we must not oppose a bad railway bill lest Government ownership be next brought forward, how could we withstand Government ownership if its champions talked darkly of worse behind?

President Hadley deprecates a "factious opposition" to the Hepburn bill, or any amendment of it which will not "satisfy" Mr. Roosevelt. But the real question is whether he would deny the principles stated by Senator Foraker. If intelligent men are to hold up their hands at the first demand of the demagogue, what chance is there of resisting his second and third demand? We shall have taught him the trick, and he will not be slow to apply it on every occasion. What need he care for your arguments, your warnings, your law, your precedents, your demonstrations, if you announce in advance that you will abandon them all if he only threatens loudly enough? We can never, in a democracy, get away from the duty of every man standing up stoutly for what he believes to be right and just. If our men of leading are to go hastily with

the crowd, such a thing as a led democracy will disappear. President Hadley defends his sinking of his own convictions of justice on the ground of public policy. But he would have done well to have taken counsel of that great political thinker who said: "It is with the greatest difficulty that I am able to separate policy from justice. Justice is itself the great standing policy of civil society; and any eminent departure from it, under any circumstances, lies under the suspicion of being no policy at all."

THE "SQUARE DEAL" WITHOUT DETAILS.

It was a great public service which the *Tribune's* Washington correspondent did last week in giving us an exact account of the railroad-rate bill which the President really wants. Admitting that there has been "considerable haziness" on the subject among even the "ordinarily well-informed members of Congress," the correspondent proceeds to blow away the last vestige of the haze as follows:

"Among those who have enjoyed the President's confidence, however, in the last few weeks no misapprehension exists. They know plainly what he wants, for he has not at any time disguised his course or his feelings. He wants a rate bill that will be fair to shipper and railroad alike; that will put an end to the present discrimination against individuals, commodities, and localities; one that will go into effect as soon as possible, and one that will hold water in the highest court of the land."

This reduces the whole complex matter to simplicity itself. The recipe is as admirable as the dear old prescription of Republican platforms for framing a protective tariff. Do we not all remember it? "A tariff so adjusted as fully to protect American labor without unfairly burdening the consumer, and levying such a tax upon foreign goods as will not expose American industries to unfair competition from abroad nor permit them to form oppressive combinations at home, etc., etc." It is a very butter-woman's jog-trot of meaningless generalities, which any man could rhyme you on any subject by the hour. We know that tariff "square deal," with details carefully withheld, and it begins to look as if the railway square deal were like unto it. The President's attitude, so bluff, so hearty, so straightforward, has a resemblance to that of the Czar who was consulting with the engineers about the first railroad from St. Petersburg to Moscow. He finally laid a ruler on the map, drew a straight line between the two cities, and said, "Build me that road." Similarly, the President directs Congress, "Pass me a railway bill which shall give a square deal to all concerned."

Now, if Congress could only get on without having actually to study phraseology and legal effect and constitutionality, nothing could be finer than

this. A joint resolution embodying the President's language would pass both houses without a single vote in opposition. The railroad Senators would rise as devoutly as Dolliver and Tillman to vow, with their hands on their hearts, that they favored the squarest of square deals for shipper and carrier alike, the Supreme Court not forgotten, and would then be ready to sing the doxology. But, unluckily, that sort of thing does not "get us forrarder." Somebody, in the end, has got to buckle down to the disagreeable work of examining the language of the bill, balancing its clauses, scrutinizing each provision, mastering railway practice, collating decisions of the Supreme Court, and looking before and after like reasonable beings engaged in crucial legislation. In this business, general principles, even of the most glitteringly platitudinous sort, are not of the slightest help. A young Oxford graduate whom Lord Salisbury was proposing to take into the Foreign Office, expressed the hope that he would not be too much "vexed with details." "My dear sir," said the seasoned statesman, "details are everything." They certainly are in framing a statute to regulate a business capitalized at more than \$14,000,000,000.

It is really a sort of French idea of legislation which the President appears to have in mind. An old fashion of the Chamber is to accept a measure *en principe*. This is sometimes done with great effusion and enthusiasm, the Deputies embracing each other with tears of joy. But thereafter the law has to be sent to committee for *rédaction*, and then the miserable "details" get in their work and there is the very devil to pay. Sometimes the bill is never heard of again; it expires in the vain endeavor to disentangle itself from general principles and take on specific and legal form. Still, there has been the great rejoicing over the adoption of the "principe," just as Senator Dolliver said on Thursday the American people were rejoicing over the new rule for legislation by Congress, that is, the "square deal." If the details are awkward, why, just omit them, and pass on to the next occasion for being tremendously square but conveniently vague.

The great distinction of Anglo-Saxon legislation, as contrasted with the French, is, as Sir Samuel Romilly long ago insisted, that it is immersed in the concrete. It does not know how to separate *principe* and *rédaction*. The principle that cannot be reduced to precise terms, does not exist for it. If you are unable to state your grievances in writing, or to propose their remedy in a bill which will hold water, then go your way and hire a hall, but don't come to Parliament or Congress. Those are places only for men who can think in terms of statutes. And these legisla-

tors, who actually have to draft bills knowing that the minutest shading of phrase, or even the punctuation, may make all the difference in the world, understand that what they have to do is, not to legislate grace, mercy, and peace, or even the square deal, into existence, but to find the specific legal remedy for specific abuses. If they are stanch in their duty, they will say, "Keep your square deal for outside consumption, but give us the details of your bill. Tell us exactly what form of judicial review will be satisfactory to you." And when Senator Dolliver talks about "a storm brewing" over the fact that "some men in a few years make hundreds of millions of dollars," they will ask him to take the bill and show where anything of that kind is written in it, or what it has to do, anyhow, with the obligation of representatives sworn to uphold a Constitution that forbids taking away any man's property without due process of law.

SHOE PRICES AND FREE HIDES.

The news that the price of shoes will have to be raised in the near future unless something is done about the tariff on hides, was the most important, so far as the general public is concerned, that came from the convention of the National Boot and Shoe Manufacturers' Association in this city a fortnight ago. The National Shoe Wholesalers' Association meeting in Boston five weeks ago took the same view. The Massachusetts State Board of Trade more optimistically passed on February 27 a resolution stating its belief that removal of the tariff would cheapen "heavy staple shoes worn by farmers and laborers." The helpless consumer, however, though he has grown used to similar experiences, is waiting apprehensively for the new prices to go into effect.

The ready-made shoe is, in fact, something more than a common article of trade. It is at once a social institution and a barometer of the cost of living. Such shoes are made, to be sure, in various qualities and at various prices, but there is a sort of standard middle quality which is advertised so widely and by so many firms that no one can help knowing about it; and it is probably worn by more people than any other grade. This was once the \$3 shoe. It is now the \$3.50 shoe. One of these days we shall wake to find that it has become the \$4 shoe.

Perhaps the most striking thing about the present situation is that there is nowhere apparent any disposition to regard the proposed advance of prices as an extortion, as people do when they have to pay more for meat or oil. Alone among manufacturing interests, the shoe men seem to have been able to convince their customers that higher prices are really a regrettable necessity. In the first place,

there is no Shoe Trust. The shoe industry is one of the last footholds of free and general competition. But, besides this, it is an industry which, instead of asking Government favors, is perfectly willing to relinquish the present 25 per cent. duty on its finished product, if it can only be relieved of the 15 per cent. levy on its raw material.

While no one is foolish enough to expect anything to be done by Congress to remedy the present conditions, there has been a good deal said this year on "the state of the Union," in which the price of footwear is not an insignificant factor. Even the Hon. Augustus P. Gardner of Massachusetts admitted that 65 per cent. of the manufacturers in his district would be willing to have the shoe duty abolished, though he insisted that the other 35 per cent. would "concede a reduction, but cannot consent to the entire removal of it." Mr. Perkins of New York, a stanch Republican, combating the idea that the hides question was a local one, affecting only Massachusetts, recalled that the delegations coming to Washington this year to ask the removal of the duty included manufacturers from Rochester, Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Louis, St. Paul, and Minneapolis, besides the Massachusetts towns. This is a national issue even as regards the location of the industry affected, while it is hard to imagine any business move more universally felt than a change in the price of shoes.

As to the precise relation of the hides tariff to the market price, estimates differ. Mr. Perkins argued that even if the tariff added only two cents a pair to the cost of making shoes, it ate up about one fifth of the average profit. Gov. Douglas of Massachusetts, in a letter printed in the *Congressional Record*, said on this point:

"The hide duty adds about seven cents a pair to the cost of producing the grade of shoes I manufacture. I also wish to make it quite plain to the public that, while an increase of but seven cents in the cost of manufacture of a pair of \$3.50 shoes may seem a small and unimportant matter, that amount represents more than the net profit of the average manufacturer. . . . To put \$2,250,000 into the Treasury of the United States as the result of the duty upon hides, we put about \$7,000,000 of unnecessary tariff profit in the hands of the Beef and Leather Trusts. This puts an iniquitous tax upon the sole-leather industry of about \$10,000,000, and disables that industry in its fight for the markets of the world."

And what is the argument on the other side? Apparently, there is none except ridicule of the idea that two or seven cents is worth worrying about, and the assertion that the shoe industry is doing very nicely as it is. Nobody longer has the face to declare that the schedule does the farmer any good. As James G. Blaine said when the McKinley law was being framed: "It will benefit the farmer by adding 5 to 8 per cent. to the price of his children's

shoes. It will yield a profit to the butcher—the last man that needs it.” His prediction has been more than verified. The farmer gets no more for his cattle than he did before the duty was clapped on. In this country, cattle are not raised for their hides in any case, and no one seriously supposes that the supply would be reduced by the smallest fraction were the tariff to go. The fact is, this country at present uses up the hides of all its own cattle—raised primarily for food purposes—and then goes abroad for what it needs over and above these. Although only one-fourth of the quantity used is imported, the price of the three-fourths of domestic hides is kept at an artificial figure by that fraction. By far the larger part of the enhanced price goes straight to the great packing houses. As the president of the Boot and Shoe Association affirmed, an increase of 28 per cent. in the cost of raw material had been accompanied in the last three years by a 25 per cent. increase in the cost of labor.

The American shoe is a product in which the country takes a genuine pride. Yankee ingenuity, business methods, and talent for organization have made it what it is. Henry James found it one of the things worthy of inclusion among the impressions of his recent visit here. And just because it is willing—the metaphor forces itself—to stand upon its own feet, because it is not controlled by a monopoly, we must, forsooth, continue taxing it for the benefit of two other Trusts.

DREAMS OF YOUNG SOCIALISTS.

It would be easy to poke fun at the group of social reformers who have been holding a three days' meeting in a home of luxury to denounce wealth. If the Germans have their Socialists of the Chair, we have ours of the Easy Chair. The real fighting Socialists, down in the grime and murk of it, living on \$20 a week, organizing in back-rooms and proselytizing through midnight meetings in the streets; knowing exactly what they want and working for it year in and year out, election after election—their sense of brotherhood born of desperate struggle, and poverty with them something burnt into the blood and not a literary material—such Socialists, we say, might well be excused if, at the sight of dilettante writers and inheritors of great fortunes going to discuss Socialism at dainty breakfasts, they should exclaim, “Oh, wonderful, wonderful, and most wonderful wonderful, and yet again wonderful, and after that out of all whooping!”

We feel, however, that though it is impossible to take this combination of magazinists and millionaires very seriously as individuals, we are bound to reckon with the sentiments which

vaguely agitate their breasts. Youthful enthusiasms like theirs always signify. The significance is not ordinarily what they think it. As Lowell said of himself, it is easy for boys who know that they are excited to believe that they are inspired. Yet it remains true that young men have often a prophetic sensitiveness to coming ideas and movements. The dreams of their youth sometimes become the realities of their old age. This is why no interested observer of the political ebb and flow can afford to neglect what the young men are reading and thinking and hoping. In this sense, at any rate, the Noroton conference is entitled to the benefit of the saying, *Maxima debetur pueris reverentia*. It is true that some of the conferees would have to seek advantage of the English decision that a man is to be held “young” until he is sixty; but most of them are engaging youths, whose humanitarian impulses we must respect even when we find their reasoning shallow and muddy, and whose attitude and talk are a sort of instructive experiment in the actual working of socialistic notions.

They show us, for one thing, how vain, as a rule, are the attempts to check Socialism by placating it. Some people, of course, in political theory as in theological doctrine, are willing to stop in a convenient half-way house, but with the mass, and in the end, logic will have its way. The amiable young Mr. Patterson of Chicago shows the true inherent tendency. A year ago, he was happy in municipal ownership as precisely the instalment of Socialism with which we ought all to be content. But he has now moved on—much faster than municipal ownership in Chicago—and wants all the means of production to be assumed by the Government. His arguments are innocent-minded in the extreme, but his motives are humane, and he illustrates neatly the natural course of the socialistic disease. To conciliate Socialism by becoming socialistic is an attempt that has often been made, but its invariable result is failure. Germany furnishes the classic example. Her great, intricate and costly scheme of workmen's insurance was taken up avowedly as a means of staying Socialism; but the Social-Democratic vote has gone on mounting even faster. To expect anything else would be to ignore human nature in the Socialists as much as they ignore it in others. One may, of course, support a measure which is dubbed socialistic, and may do it on grounds of public interest and justice; but let his arguments be directed to those points, and stick to the merits of the particular scheme; for the surest way to provoke and bring on an excess of Socialism is to contend that it will come unless we assent to a modicum of it. What we are to assent to is a business proposition, or a measure of proved

public utility, never to Socialism as a means of staving off Socialism.

It is highly probable that we are in for socialistic movements in this country of greater range and vitality than any we have as yet known. The ideas are certainly in the air, are infecting the most unlikely persons, and will doubtless run their course. But Socialism, after all, will find that it has to face the same old problems that have perplexed the framers and operators of government from the cave-man down. These relate chiefly to fundamental human qualities—ability and character. How can we best draw out ability? How can we keep our public servants honest? Any man who can surely and satisfactorily answer those two questions, may be said to have solved both the social problem and the governmental problem. But he will have to begin, if he is honest, by admitting that industrialism and the rewards of wealth have been wonderful developers of able men. Has Socialism any such spur to ability? If it has not, it has no philosophical justification, and will not long be tolerated by men who believe in human progress by individual variation and distinction. And the socialistic régime would be no better than the present, governmentally, unless better men were produced to administer it.

There will be no happy-thought regeneration over-night of that hoary old sinner, the world. It is a vast complex of life, in the coil of which we are all caught; and it is well for none of us to imagine that he has in his keeping the secret of universal happiness. No movement can be so critically important as some movements think themselves to be.

GREAT FORTUNES, OLD AND NEW.

The well-known authority in economic history, Vicomte Georges d'Avenel, has an article in the last *Revue des Deux Mondes* on the millionaires of other days. It is the first instalment of a study which he is making of great fortunes during the past seven hundred years. His aim is to work out, on the basis of the most complete documentation and careful comparison, the actual extent of accumulated wealth in France, century by century, as held by the men who were the richest of their respective generations. His conclusion, after minute inquiry, is that “the very rich of today are six times as rich and (of equal fortune) twelve times as numerous as the rich men of the *ancien régime*; and are ten times as rich and twenty times as numerous as the most opulent princes of feudal times.”

M. d'Avenel's point of departure is the 1,000 persons in the present French republic who have an income above \$40,000. Of these, 350 enjoy a revenue of \$100,000 or more; 120 have annual re-

ceipts of more than \$200,000; 50 an income of \$600,000, while ten or a dozen can count upon \$1,000,000 a year. These figures are drawn mainly from court documents having to do with the inheritance tax. Going back to ancient records, and translating their terms into the equivalent of the money-value of today, M. d'Avenel declares that *nobody* in the Middle Ages could be compared in wealth to the 50 richest men in France at present. Nobody, he adds, from the thirteenth to the end of the sixteenth century had as much as \$1,000,000 a year. The outlay of Louis IX. in 1251, the year of the crusades, did not exceed \$775,000. And we may trace royal and princely budgets down to the Duke of Orleans and Richelieu and Mazarin before we find a personal income of \$1,000,000. Louis XIV. had his \$4,000,000 a year, and Napoleon his \$5,000,000, but those sums were subject to an enormous drain, of the nature of public expense, such as no millionaire of the present day has to reckon in his budget. Among strictly private citizens, asserts M. d'Avenel at the end of his long researches, there was not one Frenchman before the Revolution who had an income of \$1,000,000.

But this new wealth differs as much from the old in nature as in extent. The rich men of six or seven centuries ago were mostly landed proprietors. Their property came to them, as a rule, through conquest, or as booty, or through royal gift. Vast estates with an army of retainers and tenants meant a large gross product of the necessities and comforts of life, but not a business capable of great expansion. Fortunes did not roll up from generation to generation; they usually tended to dwindle. It was not until the modern industrial world was ushered in that the vast new rewards for captains of industry and organizers of commerce gave them such a large share of the wealth which had been created under their hands. This is M. d'Avenel's main point. The rich are so much richer and more numerous today because of the actual creation of new stores of wealth. The large modern fortunes have come contemporaneously with a great improvement in the condition of the laboring classes whose wages in France, M. d'Avenel declares, have doubled during the period he has under review, while the cost of living has sensibly diminished. It is the new wealth that has made the new millionaires. Following hard upon legislation which aimed at absolute equality among citizens, the inrush of wealth-creating facilities has brought about greater inequality of fortune than before.

Such an investigation as that we have barely outlined, shows how little, after all, legislation can do to make head against human nature or against a great scientific and civilizing movement.

France is the country above all others in the world where laws are framed with the most passionate devotion to logic; and an avowed goal of French legislation has been, by interference with the right of testamentary disposition of property and by taxation, to render fortunes as equal as possible. But we see what glaring inequalities remain. Law and governmental theories are powerless before the developments of science, the expansion of commerce, the creation and satisfaction of new wants among millions of people. The law did not give these, and it cannot take them away. And we do not believe that there is so formidable a jealousy and hatred of wealth, in itself, as is frequently alleged to exist and to be growing. The sting lies in wealth unjustly acquired. It is ill-gotten gain, flaunting itself, that is the greater breeder of Socialism. Wealth fattening upon special privilege, corruptly obtained—such as the protective tariff—is the thing which inevitably and righteously provokes discontent in a republic; and for the removal of that privilege, for the abolition of all legal discriminations in favor of the rich, lovers of the only real equality among men—equality before the law—may well strive unceasingly.

STAGING SHAKSPERE.

Mr. John Corbin, in the current *Atlantic*, attempts something like a reconstruction and defence of the Elizabethan stage. He shows conclusively that, contrary to the representations of some literary historians, that stage was by no means barren or artless, and that its methods were far from puerile. The costuming, for example, was of the richest sort. There was no lack of properties called for by the action. The playhouses compared favorably in size, and assuredly in architectural propriety, with our own. Since the stage projected into the pit and the actors were, in a sense, among the audience, the scenes were planned for plastic rather than pictorial effect. There was no front curtain, and changes of properties usually took place unobtrusively while a vivacious front-stage scene was in progress. The simplicity of the arrangement, while permitting great lavishness of costuming and decoration, taxed the actor heavily—for he never sank into the picture—and made equal demands upon the dramatist, who had neither the aid of specific back scenes nor that of the curtain drop. His task was to provide a closely knit and practically continuous action—to charm his audience by sheer histrionism.

For a revival of this method of presenting Shakspeare, Mr. Corbin makes a very temperate plea. So far as this means abolishing the tedious waits incident upon elaborate setting, and giving the text without serious abridgment

or rearrangement, we heartily agree with him. The performances of Mr. Ben Greet's company, in spite of their evident deficiencies, at least proved that Shakspeare should be played swiftly and continuously, and that the costly and elaborate mountings of recent times are not only superfluous, but positively detrimental. These confessedly mediocre performances of practically the entire text make the elaborate revamping of Shakspeare "acting versions," from Nicholas Rowe's time to our own, seem very like a stupendous sacrilege. Mr. Ben Greet's considerable financial success has also proved that the over-elaborate scenery and consequent mutilation of the book, professedly the sole means of attracting the modern public, are in reality so many concessions to stupid traditions of stage managership.

But it is one thing to say that Shakspeare is perverted on our stage, and another to urge the restoration of Elizabethan modes. No one seems to have perceived the paradox that, except as an academic recreation, the return to the Elizabethan stage is the most insincere of all archæological revivals. Mr. Irving's, even Mr. Daly's, archæologizings had the merit of representing Shakspeare's imaginary world with some regard for historical propriety, and at least in conformity with nineteenth-century habits of visualization. To reproduce the costuming and setting of Shakspeare's time is to assume to see with the mind's eye of his contemporaries—a laudable diversion in a student of the stage, a patent insincerity in the average playgoer. In short, the true imitation of the Elizabethan theatre would require in the pit and on the stage alike a royal indifference as to the exact locality of the scenes and a complete ignorance of the walk and habit of earlier times. One might conceive a genuine Elizabethan revival on the exposed stage of a continuous performance theatre. *Romeo* should attend the Capulet's ball in a claw-hammer coat; *Juliet* should receive him in the white chiffonery of a débutante; *Cæsar* should stalk in the trappings of a lieutenant-general of the United States army; *Hamlet* in the modest frock coat and spats that princes affect in their unofficial visits. That would be as near a genuine Elizabethan performance as our times may hope to compass; to facsimile the Globe, the Swan, or the Fortune is mere archæology, and has little to do with the actual problem of staging Shakspeare aright.

The study of the Elizabethan stage has at least shown that the performance of Shakspeare should be continuous—Mr. Ben Greet's players, giving nearly the entire text, usually finish an hour earlier than our elaborate revivals, which cut the book severely; and that scenery and properties should be simplified to con-

form to this condition. All this is quite compatible with the structure of the modern stage. A skilful use of front drop scenes, against which modern managers entertain a singular prejudice, will usually give time for the preparation of the necessarily elaborate settings. The main thing is that no changes should be made at the cost of delaying or interrupting the action or of sacrificing the text. If this cardinal principle be adopted, it will follow necessarily that the scenery and properties must be of a simple sort, typical rather than realistic or sumptuous; in short, just about what an Elizabethan playwright would have demanded if he had foreseen the curtained stage and the invention of sliding "flats." Any one who is familiar with the classic stage in France, knows the advantage of what may be called typical scenery—something that is vaguely a palace or a bourgeois interior, a forest or a plain. That Shakspeare sacrificed this advantage was due, presumably, not to his conception of the drama, but to the physical limitations of his stage. But there seems to be no good reason why we should deny to his text the facilities he would have welcomed joyfully.

Performances of the sort outlined above might confidently count upon public support if the acting were merely tolerable. Purists will hold that out of this compromise with modern stage conditions might come a further and spontaneous reversion to the Elizabethan mode. One may imagine plays given before a sumptuous but purely generalized background which should stand at will for any local habitation of the dramatist's imagination. With such a fixed decoration, the use of the curtain and of the drop scene might be reduced to the minimum, and we should have what would be in spirit a revival of the Elizabethan manner and, incidentally, perhaps, the ideal setting for all poetic drama. What stands in the way both of the practical compromise and of the not impossible ideal we have suggested is not the absence of good will in the public. The hindrance to both projects lies rather in narrow traditions of stage managership, and, more seriously yet, in the almost complete absence of players who can either assume the carriage, or properly recite the lines, of Shakspeare's characters.

THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN ENGLAND.

LONDON, February 20, 1906.

The political situation in England may be regarded from two different points of view. We may, on the one hand, note two or three striking political facts which are as novel as they are important; we may, on the other hand, turn our attention towards the peculiar position of public opinion with regard to facts of which no one can deny the existence.

Three facts dominate the whole situation. The first is the complete rout of the Unionist party; the followers of Mr. Balfour and Mr. Chamberlain, as well as the Unionists who have been mainly guided by the Duke of Devonshire, have suffered an almost unprecedented reverse. It certainly cannot be paralleled by any political disaster which has befallen a political party during the last seventy years. To find anything comparable to the defeat of 1906, we must go back to 1832, and recall the election which followed upon the passing of the Reform Act; the great Tory party, which had ruled the country for some sixty years, was represented in Parliament by less than 200 members. Observers of the day thought for the moment that Toryism was annihilated, and that the Reform Act was only the opening of a sudden and complete democratic revolution. The knowledge that, within two years, Toryism, under the guidance of Peel, had been transformed into Conservatism, and all but balanced the power of the Whigs, conceals from critics of the twentieth century the reasonableness of the belief in 1832 that years must elapse before the classes which had ruled England could recover any authority. The recollection of the revival wrought by Peel may possibly cheer the Unionists of 1906, but it is absolutely necessary that they should in the first place realize the greatness of the disaster they have undergone.

The second fact is the creation of the Labor Party. We may safely say that, even immediately before the general election, no leading statesman had anticipated the triumph of the wage-earners. Acute observers had, no doubt, noticed the growing deference paid by members of Parliament to the wishes of trade unionists. Such observers felt that, by degrees, the artisans of the towns, as also the country laborers, would learn their power and exert an influence far greater than they had hitherto exercised, but few were the men of the middle classes who, whether inside or outside Parliament, anticipated that the Labor members would, after the general election, form a body of at least fifty men, and, as we may safely conjecture, be able to influence the votes of at least fifty members who are neither workmen themselves nor strictly the special representatives of workmen.

The appearance in Parliament of the Labor Party shows, it has been said, that democracy has come of age, and, like most persons on obtaining their majority, is determined to take the management of affairs into its own hands. The existence of the Labor Party bears witness, it is true, to the progress of democracy, but it does far more than this—it proves the growth, not exactly of Socialism, but of socialistic ideas; it shows, moreover, and this is the circumstance which most naturally excites alarm, that the body of wage-earners are inclined to form a parliamentary party which shall avowedly and primarily further the interest of a class rather than the interest of the nation as a whole. Let me not be misunderstood. Every class, when it has the power, legislates, though often quite unconsciously, with a view to its own interests. The landowners, who were dominant in the Un-Reform Parliament, undoubtedly showed a strong bias in favor of legislation which was supposed to

favor the interest of country gentlemen. The ten-pound householders, who gained power under the Reform Act of 1832, assuredly displayed a tendency to pass laws which promoted the objects dear to the middle classes; but neither the landowners nor the ten-pound householders ever chose representatives whose deliberate object it should be to legislate in favor of the land or trade. The peculiarity of the Labor Party is that it, nominally at least, exists to look after the well-being of a particular class. An optimist may find reason to hope that the working-classes may not in the long run adhere to the idea of legislating for the good of a particular class, and that they will look at national affairs from a national point of view; still, optimism is no very safe guide, nor, it may be added, is pessimism. All one can say is, that at the present moment the Labor Party in its adherence represents the interests of a class in a way in which no English party has ever done before.

The third fact is, the strange want of any political guides to whom the nation can look up with special confidence. Mr. Balfour and Mr. Chamberlain are men of talent, and have at times enlisted large bodies of admiring followers, but their following is for the moment all but destroyed. In any case, they are generals who have so conducted their campaign as to lead a huge army to ruin. It is impossible, for leaders who have been defeated to claim or receive the trust due to success and victory. At Birmingham they trust Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Balfour has still in Parliament ardent friends; but no impartial critic can pretend that, throughout the nation, there is any feeling of ardent enthusiasm for the two men who were the most conspicuous figures in the cabinet of which Mr. Balfour became the head. Nor is the Liberal Party richer in leaders who excite national enthusiasm than is the Opposition. Campbell-Bannerman is certainly not what you call in America magnetic; he is not a thrilling speaker; one is told that in the House of Commons he reads his speeches. If they are written, they have certainly not the merit of epigrammatic terseness or literary polish. The last quality which any one ascribes to a Scotchman who describes himself as "canny," is the capacity of exciting enthusiasm. He has many respectable and some few eminent colleagues, but it would be idle to pretend that any one of them arouses the kind of enthusiasm which in very different ways was excited by Gladstone or Disraeli; none of them commands the kind of trust which large bodies of men gave, whether rightly or not, to Peel, to Lord John Russell, or to Palmerston. The Government possesses an overwhelming Parliamentary majority, but it does not possess a single man whom we in flattery can call the idol of the nation or even of the Liberal Party.

So much for the political facts; turn now to the condition of public opinion. On all hands one hears about proposals for change. It is certain that the Labor Party, at any rate, hopes for measures which, whether wise or unwise, may certainly be called revolutionary, not because they are likely to be accompanied by violence, but because they touch the very basis of English social life. If any one is inclined to deny this, let him consider the immense effect which,

whether good or bad, must be produced by the attempt to provide the people of England with a system of old-age pensions paid for out of the national taxes. Let him remember at the same time that this system must be most intimately connected with and change the whole character of the Poor Law, and must accustom the whole population of England to build upon help derived from the State. Leading men of both parties, such as Mr. Chamberlain and the present prime minister, have expressed their sympathy, to use the mildest term, with a policy which, on the view of the best known among its advocates, must cost the country at least £17,000,000 a year. This innovation, moreover, is merely one of many. The trade-unions, which are already powerful, are demanding not rights, but privileges, and their demand is likely to be granted.

In plain truth, collectivism or Socialism is advancing with rapid strides; its ideas, if not yet carried out in practice, are to a great extent conceded in theory. The victory, indeed, of free traders at the elections gives from one point of view a false impression, abroad at any rate, of the condition of sentiment in England. No sensible man, of course, unless he be a statesman pledged to some doctrine of fiscal reform, can doubt that the electors have by an immense majority condemned as decisively as it is possible any protectionist policy. In so far they have maintained the doctrine of Bentham, of Cobden, and of Bright; but let no one suppose that this condemnation results from adherence to the old school of Liberalism, whose members believed heart and soul in the sacredness of individual freedom and the wisdom of *laissez-faire*. An English elector of to-day will not vote for protectionist members because, naturally enough, he prefers the "Great Loaf" to the "Little Loaf," and dreads any return to a tax on corn; but in other respects the average elector has rejected the dogmas dear to the old Liberals. He assuredly demands State aid and State interference at home. It is not at all certain that he objects to protection against foreign competition with native industry. It is this latent affinity of Socialism to protection which gives more strength to Chamberlain and the new Birmingham school than they are supposed to possess by observers who note nothing but the triumph of the Liberal Party.

However this may be, socialistic ideas have at last obtained full, perhaps excessive, representation in Parliament. This fact is important, but hardly surprising; what excites astonishment is that, among the well-to-do classes, the prospect of revolutionary legislation and revolutionary administration apparently arouses neither enthusiasm nor opposition. It were curious to examine into the causes of this political apathy, but to trace it to its source is a task which certainly cannot be performed at the end of a letter which is already long enough. My only wish is to discharge at this moment the humbler duty of directing the attention of your readers to a singular political phenomenon. All the signs of the day point towards the imminence of attempts, at any rate, to effect fundamental changes in the social life of England. This new Radicalism, with its vague aspirations and only half-formulated creed, touches the

foundations on which our whole system of commerce and of property rests. Yet no one is excited, no one as yet avows alarm. Is this the calm of good sense and sound judgment, or the apathy produced by the conviction, imbibed from an experience of, say, a century, that changes which seemed large and revolutionary in their day have never shaken and have hardly modified the basis of English society?

AN OBSERVER.

THE NEW ITALIAN MINISTRY.

FLORENCE, February 15, 1906.

Uninteresting as are the details of ministerial changes in Italy, the late crisis has awakened such unusual excitement throughout the country, and is so seriously commented on by the Continental press, that a succinct account may be welcome to the readers of the *Nation*. The advent of Sydney Sonnino as Premier and Minister of the Interior, in company with Ettore Sacchi, acknowledged leader of the Radical party, and Pantano, a fervent Mazzinian and still a Republican in theory, is a notable event. Eight years ago, Sacchi and Pantano were the most formidable and successful opponents of Sonnino, then the supporter of Pelloux and his coercitory measures growing out of the disorders that occurred in all the great centres from Milan to Bari, from divers causes—here, famine; there, crying oppression of the peasants by the owners of the soil; general discontent with taxation, everywhere heavy and generally unjustly assessed. States of siege, bloodshed in Milan and in other cities, the arrest and imprisonment of the editors of all Liberal papers, were the measures resorted to with the sanction of Sonnino. Coercive laws were introduced in Parliament, and then the Obstructionists, none more determined than Sacchi and Pantano, commenced operations and rendered all discussion impossible. On this, Pelloux obtained the royal decrees which converted the obnoxious bills into law. Again Sonnino stood by Pelloux, and by deeds and words proclaimed the necessity for the intervention of the Crown when it was possible for a minority to hinder the discussion of measures proposed by the Government and likely to receive the sanction of the majority. Naturally, Sonnino was at that time the best-hated man in Italy; all his real services to the country forgotten or reviled. Real services they were, for when he undertook, between the years 1892-96, to reorganize the finances of the country, Italy was on the verge of bankruptcy—the Government discredited by the bank scandals, commercial and industrial depression offering apparently no resource. Setting his shoulders to the wheel, he succeeded in lifting the State coach out of the rut; by economy to the bone and merciless taxation, he restored equilibrium between revenue and expenditure, and gained a signal victory. The country, as a whole, breathed freely; honor was saved, foreign nations applauded. But the taxpayers, bleeding at every pore, hated the hand that had saved their country at their individual cost; and when the hour of vengeance fell, they added their stones to the hailstorm that assailed the unpopular minister! "The skies might fall, but never more could Sydney Sonnino sit on the ministerial benches." Yet, there

he is, Prime Minister, Home Minister, acclaimed as a necessity by the country, and feebly opposed by the supporters of Giolitti and Fortis.

The *modus vivendi* with Spain aroused the hostility of all the wine-producers, vendors, and consumers of the country. Fortis declared that he would stand or fall with his colleagues—that, if a hostile vote censured the three real negotiators of the treaty with Spain (Ferraris, Rava, and Tittoni), he would resign. They were censured, but some sixty-four of the hostile voters affirmed their confidence in the general policy of the Ministry, and Fortis, in an evil hour, allowed himself to be persuaded to attempt the re-formation of the Cabinet, well aware that, in losing the three above-mentioned colleagues, he parted with the only men of worth, and would be unable adequately to replace them. His evil genius was, of course, Giolitti, who had used Fortis only as a stop-gap, and who, though restored to "boisterous health," was not yet inclined to return to the helm, as railway affairs were in a worse plight than when he abandoned the Ministry. In fact, no one would join the second Fortis Ministry—no one of any note or value. On which, after a crisis of forty days, he presented himself to the House with seven new and three of the old ministers, including, astounding to relate, Tedesco as Minister of Public Works—Tedesco, who had muddled all from the beginning, reviled and insulted Fortis and Carcano, Minister of the Treasury; moreover, with no solution of the railway problem, and only the promise "that the Government would present a set of measures which would lead to rapid results, and would unhesitatingly face all possible responsibilities."

The scenes of the three days that followed explain the phenomenon of a Sonnino-Sacchi-Pantano Ministry, which is welcomed by the country with as much satisfaction as surprise. On the second day, Fortis attempted a feeble refutation of the arguments brought forward by the chiefs of the Opposition, and at the close challenged Sonnino, "who appears to be the commander-in-chief of these diverse oppositions [cries of yes! yes! yes! from all sides of the House], to expound his and their ideas. My opinions I will explain when I know yours." Sonnino, accepting the double challenge of Fortis and (on the previous day) of Turati, Reform Socialist, did unfold his views, and the House listened to his lucid speech with breathless attention. He reviewed the history of the last five years: reiterated promises of reform, not one fulfilled, and no shame manifest when delinquencies were brought home to the sinners. He dwelt, as an instance of the insincerity of the Fortis Ministry, on the postponement of the railway liquidation. He next depicted the anarchy and chaos of all the administrations of the State; then dwelt on the Government and local administration of the southern provinces, and narrated the electoral scandals of the late bye-elections at Amalfi and Gaeta, where the outrageous interference of the Government and its agents had brought the communes to the verge of revolt, ending in the fortunate defeat of the Ministerial candidate. "The imposing necessities of the southern provinces demand immediate solution; but this can never be attained until we have a clear

idea of the moral and social as well as economic condition of those provinces, which are closely associated with the general, if gradual, reform of our system of taxation." Of his criticisms of the general corruption, of the anarchical condition of elementary instruction and of education in general, of military disorganization, no résumé can give an idea; but his animadversions will be remembered when he puts his hand to the helm, as will also his exposition of the great public services of transportation and communication — railways, trams, post, telegraph, telephone, etc.

He referred briefly to the question of universal suffrage in answer to several questions as to his present opinion, saying that his views remained unchanged, and proposed that, as a step toward the social reforms which universal suffrage is supposed to be alone able to secure, some of the most urgent should be at once initiated, so as to hasten the economic, moral, and intellectual progress of the neediest classes, especially those of the southern provinces and of the islands, which at present are the least represented in the National Assembly. Clearly, he was not going to be drawn into the shadow of a pledge to bring the question within the pale of present urgencies, though theoretically he accepts the principle, and in 1881 made a remarkable speech in its favor. In ecclesiastical policy he maintained his invariable position: neither persecution, provocation, nor petty warfare; respect for all creeds and opinions; loyal observance of the law of guarantees, and at the same time rigorous and vigilant maintenance of all the rights of the State, which ought to be fully able to provide for its own aims and intentions in the fields of justice, morality, and culture. The State, in short, must be capable of carrying out its own policy, and yet allow dissentients to labor freely to attain theirs. This part of the discourse was not at all to the taste of the Radicals or Republicans, the Socialists remaining indifferent. "What," he concluded, "is required of a Government to-day is the immediate initiative of positive reforms, and a severely correct conduct in political and electoral struggles."

Only one Deputy rose to defend the Government. Giolitti's self-defence was weak and continually interrupted and contradicted. The only other speech tending to elucidate the why and wherefore of the presence of Radicals in the present Ministry was Sacchi's, who gave his reasons for voting against the Ministry, while admitting that a Cabinet "all of one color is at present impossible." He had no fear for liberty "conquered and defended by a people imbued with a sense of its rights and duties." It is the practical use of liberty that is now necessary, its application to all the wants and energies of national life, whereas during the government of Giolitti and Fortis lethargy and paralysis of all activity have prevailed. He objected to the methods of military administration, to the application of the enormous funds appropriated, to the utter neglect of the tax reforms promised and possible without disturbing the equilibrium of the budget. A Liberal Government ought to defend its civil rights, maintain the glorious tradition of the State that abolished religious corporations, pro-

hibit the revival of ecclesiastical mortmain, and fortify secular instruction. In the Home Department he demanded the cessation of Governmental interference in administrative elections—the support given to one local party against another; the entire liberty of provincial and communal action, alluding to the late elections at Turin. Any ministry which should succeed in reviving or rather assisting national energies instead of neglecting and putting obstacles in their path, would be welcome to him and to the nation at large.

The House which had, at Sonnino's suggestion, allowed all the chief men to speak, now clamored for the question, and the Minister accepted Flamberti's motion that "The House approves the declarations of the Government and passes to the order of the day." Silence was maintained while the roll of the Deputies was called, with the result—yeas 188, nays 221; a clear majority of 33 votes against the Government. The Ministry resigned at once and the King accepted their resignations and called upon Sonnino to form a new one.

As the total 221 nays belong to all parties—the most numerous, Conservatives and Centre, amounting to not more than fifty—a coalition ministry was necessary. The difficulty in forming one lay in the choice of the representatives of the various non-Conservative parties, exclusive, of course, of the Socialists. Hence Sonnino's appeal, first to Sacchi then to Pantano, both of whom had refused several offers to form part of former ministries headed by Zanardelli, Giolitti, or Fortis. Why have they now accepted? Because they feel certain that, with Sonnino, they will be able to carry out some of the measures which they deem essential to national progress, neither of them imagining that they will be able to execute all or even a considerable part of their projects. They stand two Radicals in company with seven more or less Conservative colleagues. Guicciardini, descendant of the great historian, as Foreign Minister, will but follow the trend of his predecessors, maintain the Triple Alliance, and cultivate the cordial relations with France which already exist. Luzzatti, who has often figured as Minister of Finance, and now becomes Minister of the Treasury, is a staunch supporter of coöperation and popular banks. Paolo Boselli, another ex-Minister of Finance, as well as of Foreign Affairs and of Public Instruction, returns to this last unthankful office. Salandra, who returns to the Ministry of Finance, is recognized as capable and of high integrity; he was one of the staunchest opponents of the divorce bill which was so nearly carried by Zanardelli, and of which Sacchi is the zealous supporter. Carmine, well versed in finance and railway questions, is Minister of Public Works (may his good angel inspire him!). Alfred Baccelli, a young poet, chiefly known as his father's son, will have charge of Posts and Telegraphs. All these Liberal Conservatives are well known and are recognized even by their adversaries as men of worth, talent, culture, and experience.

There remain the Premier; Sacchi, the new Minister of Justice, and Pantano, the new Minister of Agriculture. Sonnino, born in 1847 of a very wealthy family, took his degree in law at Pisa in 1867, competed for and won a post in the Foreign Office, and was attached to the Italian legations

of Madrid, Vienna, Berlin, and Versailles, observing and studying. He then returned to Italy, where he and his inseparable friend, Leopoldo Franchetti, devoted themselves to social questions, in company with Pasquale Villari, whose supreme merit is that of having been the pioneer in Italy of the study of distress and its remedies. The two volumes published by the friends after a diligent personal inspection of Sicily are treasures of accurate details, photographs of the awful conditions of the island, sapient suggestions of the remedies which the State, proprietors, and the people themselves might attempt with benefit. Sonnino and Franchetti published and edited a model weekly review, the *Rassegna Settimanale*, which had then no rival and has never had a successor. Assuredly both he and Carmine, the new Minister of Public Works, have assured themselves that the solution of the railway problem is possible; also that they are capable of performing what has now become a herculean task.

They will find no more active, ardent colleagues than the two Radicals, Sacchi and Pantano. Ettore Sacchi, fifty-seven years of age, entered the House in 1882 and enrolled himself under the banners of Bertani and Cavallotti, but, though inclined to the Republican faith, he has gradually grown to believe that all necessary reforms and measures are attainable under monarchy if its administrators are honest, active, and capable. His ideas of social and economic reforms are by no means inferior to those of Sonnino; and the fact that he has refused to enter former and so-called Liberal cabinets because he did not see his way clear to get in the thin end of the wedge, and that he did accept the offer made at once by the new Premier, proves that he believes in Sonnino's intentions and possibilities. The demand of some of his confrères that he should at once press the divorce question on the Cabinet is absurd. A coalition ministry must work out the questions on which they agree to agree, leaving for the time being those on which they differ.

The same remarks apply to Edward Pantano, whose acceptance of office has astonished many and utterly scandalized the holders of antediluvian prejudices who still survive in Italy. Born in 1843, he took his degree as surgeon and physician, but at once devoted himself to the study of sociology, in which he is an acknowledged proficient. A Garibaldian on the Volturno, he also followed the Duce in his pilgrimage through Sicily to the "bitter mount," where the hero's blood, shed by the King to whom he had given Sicily and Naples, so revolted his whole nature that during that King's life the very name of monarchy was repugnant to him. A believer in Mazzini and his doctrines Pantano was and is, but the absurdities and pretensions of the Republican party often disgusted him. Still, for liberty he always fought to the last ditch. In 1898 he and Sonnino fought as man to man. But, the fight over and victory won, Pantano returned to his garret study and elaborated his projects for emigration, taking part in all the discussions on agricultural and economic questions, showing real competency in tariff matters. Often selected as reporter on commercial and industrial questions, he was chosen to regulate several negotia-

tions with Switzerland and Austria. Some five years since, the Republicans at the congress of Ancona carried some absurd rules for the conduct of electors and elected, on which he quietly but publicly withdrew from the association and from all official contact with his party. Ousted from his old college of Terni in 1904, chiefly through the hostility of his late comrades, he was elected for Giarre in his native Sicily. Bent on the passage of certain pet measures on emigration and other financial and social measures, he, who had refused all former offers, accepted after one night's reflection the invitation made by Sonnino in person at his bedside as he was ill.

The House is to be reopened on the first of March. Meanwhile, Sonnino has given orders for the cessation of the sequestration of telegrams; Sacchi has ordered the authorities to sequester no more newspapers save for violation of actual law, and never unless the cases are followed up by immediate trial. Six millions have been added to the ten already voted for the urgent necessities of Calabria.

J. W. M.

MADAME DE PRIE.

PARIS, February 17, 1906.

The history of the Regency which followed the reign of Louis XIV. will always be read in the Memoirs of Saint-Simon. There are no historical documents of equal importance on the Regency which followed the sudden death of the Duke d'Orléans, the Regent. At seven o'clock in the evening the Duke was at Versailles; he had just received a visit from the Duchess de Phalarso and the Marquise de Prie, but they had hardly entered the room when he called for help. A moment afterwards he fell, and he died at eight o'clock without having recovered consciousness. The young King was only thirteen years old. He had, on the advice of his preceptor, the Bishop of Fréjus, chosen the Duke de Bourbon, commonly called Monsieur le Duc, as his prime minister. He conferred the Regency immediately on the Duke de Bourbon. The Venetian ambassador wrote to his Government:

"The Duke de Bourbon loses no time in assuring himself of authority. He has laid hold on all the papers of the Regent and received the compliments of the ministers. I opine that this prince has not the talent or fertility of intrigue of the Duke d'Orléans. . . . If something is to be feared from this prince, it is his too condescending friendship for the Marquise de Prie, a lady of quality, but intriguing and grasping, who for three or four days has not left him for an instant and advises him on all matters."

This Madame de Prie has just been made the subject of a biography by H. Thirion. As she for some years enjoyed extraordinary influence with Monsieur le Duc, it may be said that her life belongs to history. She has not been treated indulgently by the historians, but all are unanimous on the chapter of her beauty. President Hénault says of her: "There could have been nothing prettier at the time she joined her husband, the King's ambassador at Turin." Saint-Simon says of her: "Madame de Prie was handsome, shapely, possessing an indefinable charm, of an extremely cultivated mind, with memory and the wisdom not to show it."

The Marchioness de Prie was not of noble

origin. The Rioults were among the financiers who added the name of some estate to their family name. Her mother, Agnes Rioult, was the daughter of a receiver of finances in Poitou. She married Berthelot de Pléneuf, a powder-director of France, a financier who was already a widower and was thirty-five years old. As army contractor he had increased a fortune already very large. Madame de Pléneuf became one of the queens of Paris, and was notorious for her light conduct. Her daughter at the age of fifteen was married to the Marquis de Prie, colonel of a regiment and ambassador at the Court of Turin. He was allied to the first families of the kingdom. The Marquis had no fortune, and in 1717 he found himself in difficulties and remained alone in Turin. Madame de Prie returned to Paris without him. She had learned much during the five years she had spent in Italy; she had become acquainted with many diplomatic intrigues. She had, according to her husband's instructions, to pay court to the Regent, to the Abbé Dubois, to Torcy, to Rohan, to all the powers of the day. She made accidentally the acquaintance of the Duke de Bourbon at a fancy ball at the Opéra—at least, such was the version of the time; what is certain is that he immediately fell under her sway, and remained so to the end. She flattered his artistic tastes; she had herself painted for him by Van Loo; she patronized Rosalba. She was fond of Correggio, and induced the Duke to have good copies made of the famous pictures, "Io," Danaë, "Leda." She was a good singer, and propagated the taste for Italian music; she founded concerts; she helped the Duke in his embellishment of Chantilly. The Duke de Bourbon sunk a part of his gains at the time of the South Sea Bubble in Chantilly; he constructed the palatial stables which are one of the features of this princely domain. Madame de Prie was the soul of the great fêtes which were given at Chantilly.

Madame de Prie was of an ambitious nature; she was not occupied solely with trifles and amusements. She understood that there was something strange in her fortune; she was the daughter of a somewhat despised financier and of a woman without reputation; she had many enemies—those of her own family and those of the Duke de Bourbon; her own mother had taken a place among her bitterest adversaries. Her strength lay in the weakness of the Duke de Bourbon. The death of the Duchess, which took place in March, 1720, made her task easier; but she had to conquer the neutrality of the Dowager Duchess, a daughter of Louis XIV. and of Madame de Montespan. This Duchess, according to Walpole, did not cease to entertain a great aversion for the favorite of Monsieur le Duc, but for the public eye they preserved the semblance of friendship. The brothers and sisters of Monsieur le Duc were not of much account. After the death of the Duke d'Orléans, when the Duke de Bourbon seized the power, the first object of Madame de Prie was to separate the young King from his preceptor, Fleury, the Bishop of Fréjus. Louis XV. wept copiously when the separation took place, but he was soon afterwards taken to Chantilly, where he remained about two months.

"To gain the good graces of the young monarch, there was nothing to do but to

exploit his love of hunting. Nobody could do this better than Monsieur le Duc. His forests at Chantilly and Hallatte abounded in big game, which was beginning to be scarce at Versailles. . . . Monsieur le Duc's packs had a quasi-European reputation. He was himself one of the first huntsmen of the kingdom. In proposing to the young King to devote two months to Chantilly, he satisfied his most ardent desires."

Meanwhile, the enemies of Monsieur le Duc, the ex-minister Le Blanc, Belle-Isle, and their friends, were shut up in the Bastille, and their trials began. We need not go into the details of this. Monsieur le Duc and Madame did not, however, feel quite assured of their power; they were still afraid of Fleury's influence, and set over against it the Marshal of Villeroy, who was eighty-three years old and was living in retirement in his Lyons domain. Villeroy's return to favor was of very short duration. Madame de Prie had all the ministers in hand—Maurepas, La Vrillière, Breteuil; she centralized everything, had two secretaries, and treated herself all the more arduous questions. She was the fountain of favor, gave to her husband the government of Brittany, sent Richelieu as ambassador to Vienna; she made all the lists for the King's journeys, especially for the visits to Chantilly.

The time came when a wife was to be found for the King. It was resolved between Monsieur le Duc, Madame de Prie, Villars, and a very small number of friends that the young Infanta, who was destined at first to become the wife of Louis XV., should be sent back to Madrid. The Spanish marriage had been the Regent's project; it had been accepted by Philip V. in the secret hope of bringing himself nearer to the throne of France. The Duc du Maine, the Count de Toulouse, were in favor of it, out of hostility to the house of Condé. The situation of the young Infanta was ill defined; she had been enthusiastically received in 1723, a household had been formed for her; but she had no regular, recognized title to the hand of the King. Monsieur le Duc was the enemy of the House of Orléans, and consequently disliked the Spanish marriage; he looked in vain in Germany, in England, for a princess; in the end his choice fell on Maria Leczinska, whose de-throned father was living quietly in Lorraine. Madame de Prie did not think her dangerous to her influence. On the 27th of May, 1725, the King announced publicly after dinner his marriage with the Princess Maria, almost unknown at the time. Madame de Prie took care to be represented to her as the instrument of her fortune, the devoted friend in whom she could have perfect confidence, and who would help her in all her difficulties. She named all the ladies of the Queen, herself at the head of them, Mesdames de Nesle, de Ruppelmonde, de Matignon, the Duchesses of Egmont and of Villars. Madame de Mailly was chosen for the important post of *dame d'atours*. Madame de Prie accompanied Maria Leczinska in her triumphant journey through Metz, Verdun, Sainte-Ménéhould, Châlons, and Fontainebleau.

The King and Queen of Spain were highly offended at the treatment accorded the Infanta; they had been brutally offended in their hopes and their pride. All the enemies of Madame de Prie and of Monsieur le Duc took advantage of it; the people re-

gretted the Infanta and did not approve of the marriage of the King with a penniless Polish noblewoman. Monsieur le Duc was unpopular, the treasury was empty. He was accused of speculating and enriching Madame de Prie. His enormous fortune might have placed him above the accusations of his enemies; it was not the same for her and her friends, the Brothers Pâris, the great financiers of the time. M. Thirion, however, takes her part, and tries to exonerate her.

The Duke decided to abandon the ministry. He left Versailles and went to Chantilly, where Madame de Prie followed him, as well as the Dowager Duchess of Bourbon. He received there a letter from Fleury, the Bishop of Fréjus, who had returned to favor, informing him that the King had taken the resolution to govern "by himself." Madame de Prie's position at Chantilly became untenable, as the Dowager Duchess would not see her. The disgrace of the Duke was complete; his mother accused him of having lost every thing by following the advice of Madame de Prie—"une gueuse," says Barbier in his Journal, "to whom she had taken the liberty to say *ses petites vérités*." The favorite left Chantilly and returned to Paris; by order of the King, she was exiled to the château of Courbépine, near Bernay. The Duke de Bourbon was ordered to remain at Chantilly. Madame de Prie did not survive her downfall a single year; she died at the age of twenty-eight years. Some people would have it that she poisoned herself slowly. The Venetian Ambassador, Morisini, announced to the Senate of Venice the death of Madame de Prie "*nel fior di gioventù e di bellezza*." M. Thirion does not seem to us to have exculpated his heroine from the accusation brought against her; she was really an adventuress. She was intelligent, clever, and had the perilous advantage of ruling for several years a prince of a feeble mind, who had nothing left in him of the qualities of his illustrious ancestors.

Correspondence.

MR. GOLDWIN SMITH'S VIEWS ON IRELAND.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your review of my 'Irish History' and the Irish Question, you say that my views are "markedly anti-Irish and anti-Catholic." You do me a great wrong.

My first essay, 'Irish History and Irish Character,' to which the present is a sequel, was written specially in defence of Irish character, showing that its supposed faults were not native, but the effects of a calamitous history. That essay, I am assured, had its effect at the time on the tone of the discussion, even in the House of Commons. This second essay has a not less friendly object, though, in common with Bright and many other hearty friends of justice to Ireland, I dissented, in the interest of both kingdoms, from a policy which would break their union.

To the conduct of the Irish priesthood in Ireland's dark hour I have tried to do full justice; and I believe you would hardly find stronger language than that which I have used in condemning the Penal Code.

To the aims of Philip II., Jesuitism, the Inquisition, and the *dragonnades* I have no doubt shown myself markedly opposed. To Catholics, in any sense save that of difference of conviction, I never have. Nobody could more heartily advocate Disestablishment than I did. I have numbered among Catholics some of my most valued friends, among them a principal of Maynooth.

Is a writer disqualified from dealing with the Irish question because, though he has closely followed the discussion and been in communication with those engaged, he has not been constantly resident in Ireland? Is not the question British as well as Irish? Slips on minor points there might be. To guard against these, my manuscript was sent to Ireland for revision.

Yours faithfully,

GOLDWIN SMITH.

TORONTO, February 26, 1906.

[In self-extenuation we may say that we adopted a similar precaution, and that we procured our review from an Irish Protestant in Ireland.—ED. NATION.]

ENGLAND'S LABOR PROBLEM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I trust you will allow me a few words of protest against the exceedingly one-sided article on "England's Peril" by your London correspondent, "An Observer" (issue of February 8). The "pauperization of the poor" is not the great danger of England. Pauperization is always a great evil, but a far greater and deeper-rooted evil than a temporary more or less of pauperism is the chief underlying cause of pauperism, a cause which is also largely responsible for many other evils often treated as independent moral phenomena—as intemperance, the shirking of hard work, and the low grade of civilization among our working classes—viz., the inequitable distribution of wealth, of the rewards of social service. Do American readers know how large a proportion of our working people—not of the "unemployable" class, but decent, hard-working men, without whose services society could not go on for a day—have to provide for a family, and for many "rainy days," on eighteen to twenty-five shillings a week, often with several weeks' deficit through enforced unemployment? Is it not a mockery, a pharisaism, to harp upon the want of that "self-respect," that "energy and independence," which will shun the contamination of poor relief, in men—and their wives—who, underfed and ill-housed, find no place in their domestic budget for clothes decent enough to visit any public assembly on Sunday but the public-house, or for the expense of giving to their children any better influences than those of the gutter? Yet this independence is often found among them, even when other civic virtues are starved out. Is the efficient and willing and sober American workman produced under conditions like these? The English workman is intrinsically in no respect inferior to him, as his American employers testify.

If Americans wish to know the truth about English social conditions—or those under which pauperism is bred—let them read the sober and careful statements of

investigators like Mr. Alfred Booth or Mr. Rowntree, let them read Mr. Chiozza Money's recent work on 'Riches and Poverty,' or Mr. J. A. Hobson's 'Problem of the Unemployed,' or any one of a number of other books lately written, not by Socialists or labor partisans, but by educated economists and sociologists. They will find a growing consensus of opinion that the problem of problems, that which includes in its larger scope almost all other pressing social problems, is just this: how by gradual reform so to modify and adapt our social organization, including the organization of industry, as to ensure to all who are born into our citizenship the training and opportunity to become self-supporting and independent, as civilized and self-respecting men, by efficient social service. That large numbers are at present without them, through no original fault of their own, is patent to all who have eyes to see and a heart to understand.

Most social factors are both causes and effects, and he is the wise man who can lay his fingers on the true causes. And the moral causes of pauperism are themselves to a large extent the result of removable economic causes. I admit that some of the remedies proposed for newly realized and pressing evils are but doubtful palliatives, often fraught with risk of even worse evils, at least for a time. But I have not the heart to raise the voice of the economist or the moralist—as it no doubt should be raised—without at the same time emphasizing the urgent necessity for that disinterested and energetic social reform which is the only effectual remedy. And, happily, there never was more serious thought and earnest effort in this direction than at present. We are living under new and still changing conditions, and are beginning to realize that an active and intelligent social evolution is the only safeguard against an eventual and truly perilous revolution.

Yours truly, H. J. WOLSTENHOLME.

CHRIST'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,
February 22, 1906.

SWIFTIANA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The Very Rev. J. H. Bernard, Dean of St. Patrick's, delivered here in Dublin, a few days ago, a brilliant lecture on Jonathan Swift. In the course of it he mentioned two facts connected with the great Dean of St. Patrick's previously unknown to me, and a third previously unremarked. It may be of interest to some of your readers to note them.

The weak point in the evidence in favor of Swift's marriage with Esther Johnson has hitherto been that there was no written statement concerning it until very many years after his death in 1745. A few months ago, amongst Archbishop Wake's letters preserved in the Library of Christ Church, Oxford, one was found to the Archbishop from Dr. Evans, Bishop of Meath. It is dated July 27, 1723. In it he refers to Vanessa's discovery of the Dean's marriage to Stella, and Vanessa's death. This contemporary reference strengthens previous evidence of a marriage, which no one supposes was ever more than one by word of mouth.

Until last November it was presumed the name of Lemuel Gulliver, "author" of the

'Travels,' was an invention of Swift's. There has been discovered in the muniment room of Westminster Abbey a bundle of law papers relating to an action during Swift's lifetime by one Lemuel Gulliver of Westminster, against a certain Peter Swift of Longdon in Worcestershire. Longdon is less than twenty miles from Goodwich, of which parish Swift's grandfather was vicar.

Swift's guess concerning the planet Mars is very curious. In 'Gulliver's Travels,' *Laputa*, Chapter III, occurs the following passage:

"They [the Laputans] have likewise discovered two lesser stars, or satellites, which revolve about Mars, whereof the innermost is distant from the centre of the primary planet exactly three of his diameters, and the outermost five; the former revolves in the space of ten hours, and the latter in twenty-one and a half."

This was written in 1726. The existence of two satellites to Mars was not discovered until 1877, by an observer at Washington. Swift's imagination as to the periods of their revolution is strangely near the truth—10 and 21.5 hours; they revolve in 7.5 and 30 hours. His guess as to their distance from the centre of Mars is not so near—3 and 5 of the diameters of Mars. Their actual distance is 1.3 and 3.4 of the planet's diameter.—Very truly, ALFRED WEBB.

DUBLIN, February 20, 1906.

AN INNOVATION IN HARVARD ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: An interesting change in the matter of the admission examinations has just been announced at Harvard. In future, instead of consolidating these at the close of the last two years before entrance, and granting no credit unless six or eight points are made, candidates will be free to take their examinations when they please, and will be credited with them as they are passed, regardless of the number. A candidate may then enter whenever the requisite points are registered in his favor.

This new departure will permit an intending Harvard student to be examined for college in a subject in the same year in which the subject is completed in the secondary school, and will avoid the necessity of warming over or keeping warm subjects in which lingering destroys interest, produces mental nausea, and thus prohibits a genuine advance. Besides, by stimulating an early decision in selecting a college, and obviating the prolonged final "cram," it will tend to give greater continuity and purpose to education. Hitherto, boys and parents have been rather encouraged to postpone a decision, because, as they see it, nothing is lost by waiting; and when at last a decision is made and quick results are needed, there are effective agencies in abundance through which they can be obtained. The boy who henceforth elects to go to Harvard will, if he makes up his mind betimes, get his reward in being allowed to carry forward his work naturally without congestion at the close.

An objection may be urged on the ground of the importance of the final review in mathematics, of which the elements need to be fresh in mind, in case the subject is included in the boy's college course; but this is a detail which the self-interest of

the secondary schools may be trusted to provide for.

The full practical benefit of the improvement cannot, however, be realized until other institutions adopt the same plan. Secondary schools do not devote themselves to preparation for any one institution; every class contains boys destined for Harvard, Yale, Princeton, etc., side by side, and the schools are for the most part organized on the class basis. The requirements of the less enlightened institutions therefore determine the curriculum. If Columbia and Bryn Mawr insist on concentrating the examinations in the final two years or less, then the secondary schools face the alternative of chaos or congestion. A pretty situation may arise a few years hence when a boy or a girl with a Harvard entrance certificate applies for admission to some college that has hitherto gladly accepted this evidence of fitness: will inquiry be made as to the date when the respective credits were earned, and reexamination in part or whole required? There is no telling; in the matter of college entrance you must never call a thing impossible just because it is irrational or absurd. At Vassar a ruling was recently made that a girl who may have passed the matriculation examinations of Johns Hopkins must demonstrate her fitness anew by undergoing the tests as applied by the college entrance examination board!

The Harvard move interests me, however, especially in its ultimate possibilities, for it may betoken a tendency on the part of the colleges to get off the neck of the secondary schools. The hopelessness of genuine progress lies, to my thinking, in the deadly fixity which the colleges have imposed on preparatory training. To be quite outspoken, I hold that a committee of college professors is not a proper body to exercise unlimited authority over secondary education. They are, as a rule, men of academic prepossessions and limitations, who do not, for the most part, come in contact with boys at all until their wretched prescriptions have materially harmed them; and, even then, their contact is largely at long range, through certain imperfect and precarious "feelers" called Instructors or Assistants. Fixity of the kind now insisted on is an effectual bar to progress; the situation has crystallized far too quickly. In recent years there has been a genuine and unmistakable improvement in elementary education; would it have occurred, if, to return to my cervical figure, a committee of secondary schoolmen had forged a tight collar for the submissive elementary school neck?

Let it not be supposed that I urge mutual independence of the several educational units; just the reverse! Our need is for intimate, vital, organic connection. But the so-called coöperation that we now have begins only after the colleges have prejudged the whole situation!

ABRAHAM FLEXNER.

17 BUCKINGHAM STREET, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,
March 3, 1906.

POULTRY-RAISING, ONCE MORE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The prescription for success with

poultry, given by Mr. Robinson Smith in the last issue of the *Nation*, is, "Do the work yourself and take infinite pains." Is not that a rule for success applicable to any and every business?

As a side issue and as a diversion, poultry-keeping has been a study with me for the last eight years. The old adage about counting chickens before they are hatched seems to be as applicable nowadays as it was presumably in other days. A great many people, ignorant of the work, get the idea that, having kept a few hens successfully, they can keep a larger number with correspondingly larger profits. This is a mistake, and I have seen at least a dozen instances where city people have bought a small piece of land in the country, have invested money lavishly (on a small scale), and have been much surprised to find that their poultry did not pay.

Poultry can be made to pay, but in order to do this the owner must have a peculiar aptitude for the business, and must devote his personal, unremitting attention to it. He must also be a very careful student of the conditions under which he works: nearness to market, demands of that market, appropriate season for putting his wares on the market, advertising, exhibiting at shows, economy in feeding, and utilization of waste products. A hawk, a weasel, a neglected case of roup, a colony of rats, a smoking brooder lamp, or a thief at night may ruin a season's work. Somebody—an expert—must be on the premises all the time. It is true that the owner can hire a poultryman to take care of the plant, but his wages and keep will cost so much that the plant must be pretty large to make it a profitable investment. In order to pass on the qualifications of a good poultryman, the owner must be an expert himself. If the employee should happen to leave in a "huff"—and such things do occur—the owner must be capable of running the concern himself, or suffer great loss.

The ordinary hen will lay about \$2 worth of eggs a year, and it will cost about one dollar a year to feed her. When her season of usefulness as a layer is past, she may be put on the market, and she will fetch about enough to pay for her keep from hatch to laying period—about one year with most breeds. Properly to house and yard 100 hens will involve an original outlay of about \$100. This does not include the cost of breeders and incubators.

It would seem, then, that 100 hens, one year old, should yield a profit of \$100, and 1,000 hens should yield a profit of \$1,000, and 10,000 hens should bring in \$10,000, and so on. But the fallacy lies in applying mathematics to hens. In mathematics there are no accidents, all the conditions of the problem are known and accounted for; while poultry-keeping is full of accidents and conditions which are constantly arising and which cannot be foreseen or calculated on in advance. Application of mathematics to keeping hens has caused many a broken heart and broken bank account. Poultry can be kept profitably and on a large scale by an adept in the art, who is willing to devote his time vigilantly and unremittingly to that business. The reason why so many people fail to make poultry profitable is because they don't know how and because they have not the patience.

On the other hand, perhaps my experience with a small flock of about fifty birds may be interesting. I selected one breed and bought the best that money could buy. I laid out about \$300 for house, yards, incubators, brooders, etc. I kept an accurate account of receipts and expenditures, not counting, however, chickens for table use or eggs consumed by the family of five persons. At the end of three years the flock had repaid me for my original expenditure. During the following four years they gave me a profit of about \$500 in all.

Later, I sold the place, shipped my flock to a friend in the East, and stored my brooders and incubators. But the points for consideration are, in my opinion, that I did all the work myself; I selected one breed and exhibited at shows successfully and advertised. I sold eggs for hatching at \$4.00 per setting, and I sold single birds as high as \$35.

I took the thing up as a hobby and as an amusement, and also for the improvement of my health in outdoor work. The hobby paid me at the rate of about a hundred dollars a year; it furnished me an agreeable and healthful diversion from other work of a different character. To any person having a portion of the day at his disposal, who loves animals and outdoor life, I can confidently recommend poultry-keeping—on a small scale.

E. L. C. MORSE.

CHICAGO, March 3, 1906.

A LAPSE CORRECTED.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your review of my 'Washington and the West' (containing Washington's Diary of 1784), printed in your issue of November 30, 1905, the reviewer stated: "The diary was printed by Sparks, but not in full." I have a letter from the reviewer in question which reads: "Sparks did not publish it, and I was therefore at fault in so asserting. It was a case where I depended upon memory, and my memory misled me. I owe you an apology."

I think you owe it to all concerned to give this statement as wide a circulation as you gave the error. Had the remark been true, there would have been little reason for the book.

Faithfully yours,

ARCHER B. HULBERT.

MARIETTA, O., February 26, 1906.

Notes.

Fox, Duffield & Co. have in press 'The Book of Tea,' an interpretation of Japanese life by Okakura-Kakuzo, and 'Reminiscences of My Childhood and Youth,' by Georg Brandes.

From Macmillan we are to have 'The Blackmore Country,' illustrated, by F. J. Snell; and a new edition, with supplementary essays, of E. G. Hardy's 'Christianity and the Roman Government,' under the title, 'Studies in Roman History.'

Messrs. Putnam have in preparation 'Studies in Socialism,' by Jean Jaurès; 'A Short History of Freethought, Ancient and Modern,' by John M. Robertson; and 'Notes on the History and Political In-

stitutions of the Old World,' by Edward Preissig.

'Personal Recollections of Johannes Brahms,' by George Henschel; 'Alterations and Adaptations of Shakspeare,' by Frederick W. Kilbourne, and 'Our Common Wild-flowers,' by Alice M. Dowd, are announced by Richard G. Badger, Boston.

The Oxford University Press (H. Frowde) has nearly ready Matthew Arnold's 'Merope,' edited by J. Churton Collins; to which is appended R. Whitelaw's translation of the "Electra" of Sophocles. If favorably received, this popularizing volume will be followed by others "containing some leading Greek tragedy in an acknowledged masterpiece of translation, edited in the same manner."

By inadvertence, in noticing last week the two latest issues of the Newnes "Art Library," we misnamed the American publishers, who are Messrs. Frederick Warne & Co.

The Graphical Society, which solicits subscribers at 30 marks annually, will reprint woodcuts and engravings, small books with their texts, especially blockbooks and the oldest illustrated books, series of sheets having historical or artistic connection, and works of individual masters. Each separate publication will appear in book form and be complete in itself. The editorial committee is made up of such connoisseurs as Dr. Max Lehrs, Dr. Max J. Friedländer, and Dr. Paul Kristeller. The honorary committee also abounds in the names of European museum directors and patrons of art. Evidently the new society starts under learned and distinguished auspices. For immediate publication are proposed, among many titles: 'Biblia Pauperum,' the unique Heidelberg example of this fine blockbook; the Lübeck Dance of Death, 1498 (also unique at Nürnberg); the works of Giulio and Domenico Campagnola; Boccaccio's 'Ninfale Fiesolano,' Florence, fifteenth century; the oldest illustrations of the 'Trionfi' of Petrarch, on wood and on copper; Beham's Bible woodcuts, and Adam Elsheimer's etchings. The Society's business will be transacted through the publishing firm of Bruno Cassirer, Derfflinger Strasse 16, Berlin, W., to whom application for membership and subscriptions should be sent by April 15, proximo.

The paintings of old masters in possession of the German Emperor and King of Prussia are to be published for the first time under the direction of Wilhelm Bode, Max J. Friedländer, and Paul Seidel (Berlin: Richard Bong; New York: Lemcke & Büchner). There will be 72 large photogravures, 130 illustrations in the text, and 200 pages of letterpress. The issue will be in twenty-four parts at five marks each.

Another one-volume edition of 'The Poetical Works of Lord Byron' (Scribners) follows close upon that in the "Cambridge Edition" (Houghton, Mifflin & Co.), edited by Paul E. More. The later, "the only complete and copyright text in one volume," proceeds from Ernest Hartley Coleridge, and differs from the American in arrangement, as in some other particulars, one being the index to first lines, which is alphabetized for A, I, and O in a manner somewhat old-fashioned, and makes an indexical comparison for fullness between the two collections by no means simple. The American index of titles, likewise, must be collated with Mr. Coleridge's

classified table of contents. Finally, the newer letterpress is rather faintly, though very clearly, printed. The English type page is slightly shorter than the American, as well as narrower, but the number of folios is nearly identical; as the English margins are larger, it follows that the type employed is slightly smaller. The text is authoritative.

It seemed timely, amid the great free-trade electoral campaign just closed across the water, to bring out on behalf of the losing side a new edition of Disraeli's political biography of Lord George Bentinck (London: Constable; New York: Dutton). It opens on the eve of the repeal of the Corn Laws, of which it gives the Tory view. Bentinck forestalled Chamberlain in thinking that England's commercial policy should be not free trade, but reciprocity. Mr. Charles Whibley, in his introduction, now looks to see Chamberlain "play the part then played by Lord George Bentinck. . . . He too will fight the battle of the manufacturers and the Colonial farmers. . . . Once again the Free Traders will rest their case not upon facts, but upon sentiments. Once again we shall hear an echo of Disraeli's saying: 'Protection is not a principle, it is an expedient.'" Mr. Whibley further quotes a speech of Lord John Manners in 1846 presenting the Chamberlain scheme, and congratulates the present Duke of Rutland on witnessing "the approaching triumph of a cause which has been neglected for more than half a century." This prophecy is now a little blighted.

Mr. S. M. Crothers's 'The Pardoner's Wallet' (Houghton, Mifflin & Co.) is a collection of semi-humorous moralizing essays. The title is derived, as the reader will surmise, from Chaucer's "gentil Pardoner," who, in the fourteenth century, rode straight from the court of Rome, "his walet . . . in his lappe Bretful of pardoun." A title that needs a note of explanation is, in our eyes, one of the minor unpardonable sins. Even after Mr. Crothers has explained that he intends to offer "suggestions concerning things pardonable," his essays cannot all be said to have any relation to their general title. Those on Saint Francis and on Hawthorne, for instance, would be in place in any volume of serious papers. All the essays are well written, and the pardonable sins, the prejudices, the unseasonable virtues, the fallacies of the peacemakers, who, according to Mr. Crothers, are always middle-aged or elderly and forget the ever recurrent militant temper of youth, are treated with a light hand. This sort of essay is not at all easy to write. Few readers can stand more than a few pages of humorous moralizing; and to turn out a perfect example of this kind of writing, one must have the genius and temperament of a Stevenson. But Mr. Crothers is always readable, and peculiarly ready with those apt illustrations which are usually the most attractive ingredient in this sort of literature.

Joel Benton has gathered together, under the title of 'Persons and Places' (The Broadway Publishing Co.), a group of short essays, several of which have been in print before, in the *Bookman*, the *Unitarian Review*, and other periodicals. Most of the papers are not of serious importance, but Mr. Benton has evidently devoted much

care to the one which deals with the poetry of William Cullen Bryant. The burden of his thought is a complaint that Bryant dwelt excessively on the theme of death. "The question which obtrudes itself is whether so much of the charnel-house at all times and seasons is not a serious defect in poetry. . . . Will the noblest thought, even, and the perfection of rhythm and rhyme, make the atmosphere of the graveyard permanently dear and popular?" Unquestionably Bryant did not write for all classes of readers, and in all moods. He can sing "Omnes eodem cogimur" with Horace, but the playful badinage with Lyde or Lydia, Pyrrha or Chloe, did not fall within his chosen field, and he had a right to choose his field. The question for the critic is his skill in cultivating it after it was once chosen, and, therefore, we think that the general tone of Mr. Benton's paper does the poet injustice. In large measure, however, he counteracts his own criticism with the question, "Who has not, indeed, been deeply indebted to him, if he reads poetry at all, for an immense contribution to his pleasure?" The gloom and odor of the charnel-house cannot be a peculiarly distinctive feature of any body of poetry of which such a question can appropriately be asked. Two other papers are marked by a very kindly feeling towards Thoreau, an attitude which we take to be far more prevalent than the author seems to suppose.

Miss M. Louise Greene's 'Development of Religious Liberty in Connecticut' (Houghton, Mifflin & Co.) is a welcome and creditable addition to the small list of valuable works on American ecclesiastical history. In so far as it seeks to show the connection between religious movements in Connecticut and similar movements elsewhere, particularly in Massachusetts, the work is constructed on broad lines, though we think that the development of dissent in England and the transplantation of it to Holland and America receive rather more than proportionate notice. The chief bones of contention in Connecticut were, of course, the Half-way Covenant and the Saybrook Platform; and to the development of these great statements, and of the controversies which centred round them, Miss Greene pays detailed and patient attention. One marvels, indeed, at the structure of injustice and oppression which the oligarchy of the orthodox built up and long maintained; at the harsh and cruel treatment of dissenters, from Episcopalians to Quakers and Baptists; and at the slow spread of toleration. We must confess to not finding Miss Greene's treatment everywhere sympathetic: she does not always make one feel that the controversies which she is tracing were really worth while, or enable us to understand why the men who engaged in them thought them, as they did, so supremely important. Her account of the "Great Awakening," for example, is distinctly cold, and that of the work and influence of Jonathan Edwards a bit superficial. On the other hand, Miss Greene is neither partial nor hostile, and her work, if it errs somewhat in feeling, is well stored with facts. The bibliography lists the principal authorities, including much contemporary material hitherto little used. It is rather inconvenient, however, to have the references to authorities mass-

ed at the end of the volume, with only those classed as "explanatory" given at the foot of the page.

'A Canadian Girl in South Africa' (Toronto: W. Briggs), by E. Maud Graham, is a bright and interesting account of life in the Orange River Colony during what may be termed the reconstruction period. The author was one of the forty Canadian ladies who volunteered in 1902 to teach the children in the Concentration Camps. Her first station was at Norval's Pont, where there were some thirteen hundred children, all of whom but the babies went to school. Her pictures of these Boer children, their brightness and affection for their teachers, are very attractive, while the account of the teachers' relations with the parents shows that, during the year after the close of the war, a kindly feeling between Dutch and English prevailed. The divisions of the present day are largely due, in her opinion, to the unavoidable delays in paying the war claims, the inefficiency of many of the English officials, and the educational crusade of the *predikants*, disgruntled because of the gradual stoppage of the Government grant for their support. The teachers themselves were instrumental in promoting and deepening this good feeling through their games and entertainments; the hostile factions at Kroonstad, for instance, where Miss Graham closed her service of twenty-five months, were brought together by means of field hockey contests. In the closing chapters, she treats briefly of Kafirs and labor, education and farming. Her style is simple and unaffected, and the narrative is brightened with frequent humorous touches. Many reproductions of the author's photographs add to the attractiveness of the volume.

Volume XVI. of the "Harvard Studies in Classical Philology" has two papers of rather more than the usual importance. The first of these, by Chandler R. Post, deals with the dramatic art of Æschylus, and has won for its author the distinction of the Charles Eliot Norton fellowship in Greek studies. While the purpose of the thesis is to trace the development of the dramatic art of Æschylus in the strictly technical sense of the term, it is still a paper which any intelligent student of the drama from a more purely literary point of view may read with ease and profit, even though he may not grasp the meaning of the few Greek lines interspersed here and there. The paper might well have sought a more popular channel of publication. The second of the papers referred to is a very searching discussion of the nature and origin of Indo-European inflection. No one but the specialist would be able to follow the discussion as a whole. Suffice it to say that it manifests a commendable lack of that "cock-sureness" in matters beyond the range of direct historic evidence which sometimes mars philological investigation. In view of recent recriminations in the more important field of athletics, it is refreshing to note that this contribution to a Harvard publication is the work of two Yale scholars, Professors Hanns Oertel and Edward P. Morris.

Students of Shakspeare and his Italian sources will be interested in a tiny volume published by Sansoni in Florence, with the title 'Romeo e Giulietta.' It contains,

after a brief and scholarly introduction by Cino Chiarini, the *novelle* of Luigi da Porto and Bandello, and Professor Chiarini's prose translation of "Romeo and Juliet," followed by a few notes. This version, which seems to be the fourth made in Italy in the last half-century, is a careful piece of work, and reads surprisingly well, except in some of the speeches of *Mercutio*, where an adequate rendering is impossible. Professor Chiarini had previously made himself known as a translator by his version of the Tale of the Oxford Scholar, from Chaucer, and of Carlyle's 'Dante and Shakspeare.' The dainty but inexpensive little book is dedicated to Dr. Furnivall.

"Winning the West" is the felicitous title of an account of Government irrigation work, in the *National Geographic Magazine* for February, by C. J. Blanchard, engineer United States Reclamation Service. He describes the most important of the thirteen projects now under construction, and summarizes the three years' work of the Service. Seventy-seven miles of main canals, some of which are the size of small rivers, fifty-four miles of distributing canals, and 186 miles of ditches have been built, together with 125 miles of road and 150 miles of telephone. The remarkable transformation of the country resulting from this work is illustrated by the fact that a small tract in southern Idaho, which two years ago was absolute desert, has now three towns with 120 business houses, three newspapers, one private and two State banks. On the other hand, Roosevelt, in the Salt River reservoir site, a city with electric lights, waterworks, school-houses, stores, and churches, and a population of nearly 2,000, will be submerged more than 200 feet when the dam is completed. It is estimated that the reclamation of the irrigable desert land in the West will add to the taxable property of the nation \$2,350,000,000, and provide farm homes for 600,000 families. The address of Chairman Theodore P. Shonts on the Panama Canal contains little that is new or of value, being largely taken up with a general denial of the charges of jobbery, immorality, and inefficiency on the part of those engaged in its construction. More interesting is the account, by Capt. Geo. S. Gibbs of the Coast Survey, of transportation methods in Alaska, in the course of which he remarks that while the introduction of the reindeer has improved the deplorable condition of the Indians, these animals will never become an important addition to the transportation facilities of the country. But the dog plays a part in the Alaskan life that is indispensable, and for which there is no substitute. This number is illustrated, profusely and beautifully, with reproductions of most interesting photographs.

An entirely new move in the secondary-school world of Germany is the establishment of a semi-scientific Realgymnasium for girls in Berlin. The City Council has accepted a curriculum for such a school in range corresponding to the so-called "Reform" gymnasium, from the Lower Tertia to the Upper Prima. Hitherto only classical gymnasia have been established for girls in Germany, and of these there are said to be now twenty-five in all.

Tempora mutantur. The Sultan, who has

rather stubbornly resisted the introduction of electrical appliances in the empire, has recently granted the concession for the electrical lighting of the city of Jerusalem, and for a trolley system in the sacred precincts, which is to be practically an inter-urban road, extending to Bethlehem, Bethany, and probably even to Jericho and the sacred sites that mark the tomb of Moses. The plans include even a further extension to Amman, where connection will be made with the railroad that is being built from Damascus to Mecca. Damascus also is to receive a complete system of electrical street cars, the power to be supplied by the historic Abana River, generally known by the name of Barada. Beirut, the most progressive and modern city in Syria, is now also moving to get concessions for electric lighting and cars. A number of religious journals on the Continent are protesting against this "desecration" of sacred places, deploring, e. g., that the Jerusalem-Jericho track must go directly over the Mount of Olives. This last-mentioned road, and probably the others, too, at any rate will be built by a German company.

—The illustrated magazines for March signalize "the first and dubious signs of spring," as Livy would put it, by a copious supply of out-door literature. *Scribner's* opens with the record of an automobile tour of 1,300 miles "through five countries, across twelve frontiers, and over five Alpine passes," from the pen of Henry Norman, M.P., and copiously illustrated by the author's own camera. Incidentally, the photograph of the winding road up the Stelvio pass demonstrates with unusual force the possible mendacity of the camera, exactly reversing, to the eye, the direction of the incline. Following Mr. Norman, Frederick Van Beuren, jr., essays with fair success to put into verse the geologic birth and growth of the Red Cañon. We must object, however, to "the shriek of the grinding ice." Ice may grind and ice may shriek on due occasion, but the conditions precedent and the audible consequences are essentially separate. N. C. Wyeth comes next, describing "A Day with the Round-up," with his own drawings, several of which are reproduced in the vivid colors so familiar to readers (or should we say *spectators*?) of the descriptive literature of the Southwest. Even the stories, for the most part, have a distinctive out-door flavor. In separate titles, if not in comparative space, *Harper's* is not far behind as an open-air number. "A Night's Ride with Arab Bandits," "In Western Camps," "Ibex Shooting in the Mountains of Baltistan," and "A Colorado Glacier" are among the titles. Philip Verrill Mighels offers a poetic conceit on "The Desert," which the Creator, weary of the sins and carnage of the life filling all other parts of his creation, has made "as a place to be alone." Evidently the poet has not read the chapter by John C. Van Dyke on "The Life of the Desert." There are few places, if any, where the struggle for existence is more cruel and unceasing. The *Century*, too, opens with a paper in the same general field, route notes in Sicily, "The Garden of the Sun," by William Sharp. The illustrations are from drawings by Jay Hambidge, and picture chiefly incidents in the life of the natives (mostly out-door life) rather than the scenery.

—The *Century* has a paper of practical suggestions, by Sylvester Baxter, on "Art in the Street," with drawings by Jules Guérin and Malcolm Fraser. Guide-boards, lamp-posts, telephone poles, fire-alarm and police-signal boxes, letter-boxes, watering-troughs and drinking-fountains are among the various utilities, now generally a source of odious disfigurement to village and city streets, which might, as the writer contends, be so designed as to be a source of pleasure and satisfaction to the eye and an elevating æsthetic influence upon the community. In the same number Charles De Kay gives a general description of the architecture and decoration of the new New York Custom House. The feeling so universal among lovers of things artistic crops out in his comment that the architect has not seen fit to express, even in some allegorical manner, the position of free-born Americans in allowing themselves to be treated as slaves by the collectors of customs, for the alleged good of the country. Perhaps a typical trunk-searching scene might yet be depicted on one of those wall spaces upon which Mr. De Kay thinks that the art of painting should have some worthy recognition. The general result he regards as highly creditable to the architect, chosen by competition under the provisions of the Tarsney act, and as a full justification of the abandonment of the old method, "when Government buildings were designed at Washington by the gross, and carried out without a thought of adaptability to the climate or surroundings, not to speak of beauty as objects of æsthetic pleasure."

—Students of comparative religion will be interested in Professor Bloomfield's account in *Harper's* of the recent discovery of portions of the long-lost Manichean Bible. These fragments were a part of the rich archæological treasure unearthed by Dr. Alfred Grünwedel at Turfan, in the extreme east of Chinese Turkestan, under the auspices of the German Government. They are over eight hundred in number, and are the sole known remnants of the literature to which they belong. During the past summer, Professor Bloomfield spent several weeks in Berlin, and had an admirable opportunity to examine the fragments with the constant assistance of Dr. Grünwedel himself and of Dr. F. W. K. Müller, of the Berlin Ethnological Museum, an eminent Orientalist of the younger generation. Biblical scholars will be interested to see the large Christian element which appears in these fragments. Indeed, in some passages Mani seems to be wholly identified with Christ, though elsewhere Christianity is vigorously assailed. Dr. Grünwedel has returned to Turfan to continue his quest, carrying with him a grant of 83,000 marks, and it is confidently to be hoped that large additions may be made to his already remarkable discovery.

—Prof. F. W. Taussig takes the leading place in the *Atlantic* with a paper on "Love of Wealth and the Public Service." He finds several motives which tend to hold capable men of business steadily to the work of money-making, regardless of need. Any man of energetic temperament feels that he must be doing something, and the man who is once inured to business habits really finds little else that he can do suc-

cessfully. Again, there is the natural joy of accomplished ends, or the stimulus of success, as a recent educational writer has called it. But the play of these motives is crippled in the public service by the short tenure of office and the numerous checks and balances by which a jealous democracy insists upon guarding against possible abuse of delegated power. Professor Taussig recognizes that these checks are in large degree inseparable from democratic government, but still hopes that more leeway may in time be given for the exercise of unhampered individual initiative in executive positions, so as to make public service more tempting to men of great business capacity. Considered in the abstract, his position is plausible, but the removal of restrictions upon men in positions of trust will proceed somewhat slowly until the insurance scandals are forgotten. A. Maurice Low presents a glowing defence of the German Emperor against what he conceives to be the most cruel misinterpretation of motives, misconstruction of actions, and ridicule of purposes to which any great historical character has ever been subjected. Mr. John Corbin's plea against the extravagantly pictorial stage of modern times as a vehicle for the presentation of Elizabethan drama, we have discussed elsewhere.

—In the *Quarterly Journal of Economics* for February, Prof. Adam Shortt contributes a paper on Canada's anti-dumping policy, which throws unexpected light on the true inwardness of that unique piece of legislation. Canada is the only country which has actually legislated against dumping. Her tariff act contains a clause by which articles that are sold in Canada at less than the market price in the country of exportation, are subjected to a special duty, equal to the difference between the market value and the selling price. This affects, of course, chiefly the United States, and especially such articles as pig iron, steel rails, girders, and the like. But other articles also, including some that come from Germany, are affected by the provision. Now the natural explanation of this sort of thing is that it is a protectionist device, meant to prevent the wicked foreigner from underselling. In fact, however, it is in Canada a device not of the protectionists, but of the free traders. It appears from Professor Shortt's account, that the protectionists had set up the practice of dumping as justification for demanding a general increase of duties. The liberals, as a means of stealing the protectionist thunder, adopted the anti-dumping duty—but stopped there, having a plausible ground for saying the only real difficulty had been met. At all events, Canada gets a tidy revenue out of extra duties imposed on articles that are sold in Canada at what our monopolists euphemistically call "export rates." The administration of this system calls for the maintenance of special agents to keep watch of prices in American cities, and seems to be carried on with a good deal of discretion. Information is treated as confidential; and when the Government of Australia applied to the Canadian Government for points as to dumping, the Canadian Government refused to comply with the request. We note also, in the same issue, Professor Ripley's article on the trunk-line rate system, which he de-

scribes as a distance tariff, and adduces as indicating the principle on which railway rates in general should be adjusted. The instructive map which accompanies his article certainly makes it plain that the trunk lines have in fact worked out their competitive problems on the principle of distance.

—In the interest of economic government in the Philippines, a scheme of consolidation of bureaus has lately been carried into effect. One of its results is to incorporate the Mining Bureau with the Bureau of Government Laboratories, the new organization to be known as the Bureau of Science, of which Dr. Paul C. Freer, formerly of the University of Michigan, is director. Hitherto, there has been some confusion and tendency to duplication in scientific work and publications at Manila (though far less than at Washington). Henceforth, separate bulletins will not be issued at irregular intervals, but all scientific papers will be published in a new journal to be known as the *Philippine Journal of Science*. The agricultural, forestry, and health branches of the Government service will, of course, continue the separate publication of bulletins for popular circulation. The subjects covered by the new organization of the Bureau of Science and to be especially treated in the new journal are: researches on biological subjects, including bacteriology, pathology, and allied branches of the science relating to medicine, botany, and zoology; on chemistry, including topics relating to the natural products of the Philippine Islands, to analytical and synthetical work, and to physiological and biological chemistry; researches relating to the fields of serums and prophylactics and on mineralogy, geology, and paleontology, including investigations of the mineral resources and mining operations of the Philippines. Ten numbers a year will probably be the minimum of issues of the *Journal*. The subscription price will be \$5 per year, single numbers 75 cents, and reprints of papers 25 cents, remittances to be made to the Director of Printing, Manila, P. I. The publications by the Philippine Bureau of Government Laboratories during 1902-1905 number thirty-six bulletins, the majority of them biological or pathological studies of tropical diseases affecting the human family or of the animal plagues which have wrought so much disaster in the Philippines. There are also some noteworthy additions to the knowledge of Philippine botany by Elmer D. Merrill, various chemical researches into Philippine products, and studies in Philippine ornithology. These bulletins have heretofore been sent free on application, and some copies of them are still available.

—The title, 'Negro Humour,' of Mr. J. Graham Cruickshank's trim little volume issued at Demerara from the *Argosy* press, would lead a North American to expect something more comic than he will find. These "sketches in the market, on the road, and at my back-door" are "impressions," a term which the author himself applies to the chapter on Bridgetown, Barbados. They are delicate vignettes, little studies artistically rendered; and the humor is more in the writer's sympathy and insight than in the sayings and doings of the people of color. Indeed, this class

is so intermingled in action and conversation with two others—the "Sammies" (East Indian coolies) and the "Potagee"—that one does not readily differentiate them by the test of humor alone. This, however, is a small matter, and anybody may profit by reading these glimpses of British Guiana, Barbados, and Jamaica. One character, "Old Gordon," has a sketch to himself, of some historical value; and the chapter on Wakenaam is economically instructive, as it makes a faithful but not unkind comparison of the negro's status before and since emancipation. Mr. Cruickshank furnishes a glossary, which is needed. His text is pleasantly interspersed with colloquialisms, used to heighten the local color, like "upperside the potato field," "face well and wrinkled," "middle-day," "in the crop." One will not laugh over this book, but it is none the less agreeable.

—The annual art competition of the leading newspapers of Tokio and Osaka shows the results of the war and what are the thoughts uppermost in the minds of the people, though rather to the detriment of pure art. In the bundle of newspapers published on New Year's Day in these two great cities, imperial and commercial, we find that, in ten of the multiple editions of forty or fifty pages each, five of the illustrated supplements are mechanical rather than artistic. The Emperor in one and Togo and Oyama in another appear in colors and gold. There is a sheet of portraits in half-tones, of twenty-two princes, generals, admirals, and statesmen, while another is occupied with views of the chief palaces or Government buildings of the world. The *Illustrated Nippon* contains pictures of pretty women and notable landscapes, one of these being the great double or twin rocks, linked together with the ceremonial rice-straw rope, and the larger crowned with a *torii*, to see the sun rise between which tens of thousands of people, gathering at New Year's Eve, assemble on the seashore and neighboring hills near Isé. One journal issues the sign-manual of a famous calligrapher, of slight interest indeed to an Occidental, but as full of suggestion to a Japanese as a new fishbone would be to Agassiz. This finishes the inventory of black and white. A map of Tokio in colors and a sheet of pictorial postal cards with mirth-provoking suggestions of the funny situations caused by the jostling of old and new, foreign and native customs and notions, add variety to the New Year's gifts of enterprising newspaper publishers. The color sheets are gems of artistic skill, and each one is signed by the artist's name. One, a glory in deep purple, with a spring-like background of flower-decked meadow and blossoming trees, shows a young girl, holding in one hand a white dove and in the other a sprig of pink blossoms. Another piece, twenty by twelve inches, representing a noble matron with her two young daughters in the coiffure and costume of five centuries ago, is a glory of harmonious coloring. The sprig of plum blossoms suggests the spring, for, according to the old chronology, New Year's Day came in February. One sees how difficult it is for art traditions to change with the almanac, for now the Japanese New Year's is that which the Western world keeps. Inferior to none

in drawing, expression, and pose of the figures, though with appropriate moderation in tint, is another piece in color, depicting two lads on horses caparisoned in the olden style. The bamboo and plum tree in the background tell, by their symbolism, of life that has not yet reached the stadium which the pine tree always suggests. This exhibition of pictures set against a wall gives a true index of the national taste, temperament, and power of the art-loving Japanese.

RAILROAD PROBLEMS.

American Railroad Rates. By Walter Chadwick Noyes. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1905.

Restrictive Railway Legislation. By Henry S. Haines. The Macmillan Co. 1905.

Government Regulation of Railway Rates: A Study of the Experience of the United States, Germany, France, Austria-Hungary, Russia, and Australia. By Hugo Richard Meyer. The Macmillan Co. 1905.

These three volumes contain the weightiest contributions made in the last calendar year towards elucidating our vexatious problem of railroad transportation. While unequal in value, they each contain material which we could ill afford to lose. The author of 'American Railroad Rates' is at the same time a judge of the Court of Common Pleas in Connecticut and president of the New London Northern Railroad Company. The very juxtaposition of titles will probably affront the Grangerite; but an impartial survey of the book will demonstrate that this conjunction has not been without its happy influence. It has blended the knowledge of practical railroad administration with a judicial insight into the duties which common carriers owe to the public. Mr. Haines's book comprises the substance of a course of lectures delivered at the Boston University School of Law, and abundantly bespeaks the experienced railway expert. Mr. Meyer is assistant professor of political economy in the University of Chicago. His book sweeps a wider geographical horizon than the other two, and is fortified with a wealth of annotative footnotes. Unfortunately, the scientific detachment which might be expected from an academic investigator is sometimes conspicuously absent, and the strong brief which Mr. Meyer files in favor of the railroads betrays an unmistakable *parti pris*.

Judge Noyes gives at the outset an admirable exposition of the fundamental principles of railway economics. A student of transportation fresh from the perusal of Acworth's 'Elements of Railway Economics' would inevitably be tempted to draw "the deadly parallel" against Judge Noyes's introductory chapter on "Underlying Principles." But, in a footnote on page 20, and once again on page 66 in a similar reference, the tree from which the golden apples were shaken is indicated as "an admirable little book of high authority." In a court of literary ethics it is questionable whether this bare acknowledgment would constitute a *pretium justum*. If, however, his theoretical outline was appropriated from another, Judge Noyes has given it a dress even more suitable for American readers than the original. Those who believe on *a priori* grounds that railroad

charges should be based on cost of service, equal mileage rates, or on postal principles, will find the refutation of these proposed systems unanswerable. Equally excellent is the description of the actual process of rate-making, while chapter iv., on Classification and Tariffs, is the best account in short compass of that perplexing subject available for the general reader. The author has refused to allow his immediate business interests to blind him to the real evils inherent in our present transportation system. He frankly avows (p. 103) that "Rebates and other personal discriminations too often have driven the small manufacturer from the field and left it free for the corporate combination." On the other hand, he thinks that the present law, with such changes as are necessary "to bring within its provisions . . . private cars and terminals, . . . seems to go as far as any law can go to stop personal discriminations" (p. 121). But he further acknowledges that the existing law "does not effectively reach preferences created by the tariff [railroad], or discriminations which the published rates are formed to carry out" (p. 123). Conservative as Judge Noyes is in his plan for remedying the evils of the situation, his discussion of the problem is without any unfair bias. Or if any bias is evident, it is rather the misgivings of the jurist scrupulously fearful of any departure from the letter of constitutionality than of the railroad man willing to gain a doubtful advantage for his own profit. Of 'American Railroad Rates' it may be said that it is as a whole the best balanced book on the subject that the present controversy has evoked. Its comparative brevity—it contains only 260 pages—should commend it to the busy man who wants something more than a mere superficial presentation of the railroad problem.

'Restrictive Railway Legislation,' the title of Mr. Haines's book, is somewhat misleading. It indicates rather the goal to which his argument is directed, or the impulse from which his discussion took its rise. It is not fairly descriptive of the book's contents. Indeed, no name short of Essays on Railroad Transportation would cover the variety of topics with which it deals, for railroad construction, operation, organization, finance, rate-making, and legislation all come under review. On all these subjects Mr. Haines has something to say, although his discussions are very unequal in merit. Where he speaks as a technical expert, he is surest of his ground. Where he essays a theory of reasonable rates, he is weakest. Where, finally, he attempts a philosophic résumé of the underlying forces which have been operative in our railroad history, he attains a very high degree of success.

It will probably surprise many to learn that "the region westward from Massachusetts to the Mississippi River and southward to the Potomac and Ohio Rivers is now better supplied with railroad lines per square mile than Great Britain is" (p. 103), but Mr. Haines speaks here with the word of authority. So, too, his judgment is weighty where he concludes that "the provisions for safety upon our railroad system are not up to the standards abroad, and that they have not kept pace with the increasing speed of trains and density of traffic" (p. 132). Almost equally illuminating is his comparison of English and American

methods of railroad financing, especially his unfavorable contrast of our judge-made receiverships with the English procedure for the protection of debenture holders. The practical railroad man is equally in evidence in his history of the formation of rate-sheets and in his significant disclosure of methods of according disguised rebates, as, for instance, by recognizing the switching tracks of an industrial concern as an independent railroad company, and by allowing large arbitrary percentages of an alleged joint rate (pp. 151, 152) to this pseudo-carrier.

His most unsatisfactory chapter is the one in which the question is raised, What is a reasonable rate *per se*? Instead of taking Judge Noyes's wary though indefensible position that reasonableness is always a comparative matter, and that it is about as easy to demonstrate that a certain river is deep *per se* as that a specific rate is reasonable *per se*, Mr. Haines attempts a solution of the question. He shows in the first place that *a priori* contentions for basing rates on the value of railroad property or on the cost of affording transportation service are simply inapplicable to the fixing of specific rates. His negative contention is undeniable. He proceeds to find the essence of reasonableness in a compromise rate which affords a margin of profit both to shipper and to carrier. If all traffic were non-competitive, he thinks this test would be all-sufficient. When, however, shippers at competitive points obtain relatively lower rates than are exacted from the shippers at non-competitive points, the further question arises whether the low competitive rates are reasonable from the standpoint of the shippers who pay the higher rates. Here Mr. Haines, in his economic casuistry, distinguishes between natural and artificial competitive points. Where the shipper has a choice of water or rail routes, the low rate he obtains is no injustice to the shipper who must pay high non-competitive rates. But where the shipper at a junction point of competing roads obtains a disproportionately lower rate than the local shipper served by a single carrier, the rate is unreasonable, so Mr. Haines thinks, and should be adjusted by pooling or statute to the higher level of local rates. It may be observed that the distinction here drawn by the author has been disallowed as a proper construction of "the long and short-haul" clause of the Interstate Commerce Act by the Supreme Court in the Alabama Midland case (168 U. S. Rep., 144). But the chief fault to be found with Mr. Haines's criterion is that it really fails to determine anything with precision. If any rate, with the exception noted above, that affords a margin of profit to carrier and shipper is reasonable, there is an infinite number of rates reasonable *per se* for any given railroad service. Even this fails to indicate adequately the looseness of the criterion suggested. If ten shippers at a given point continuously ship the same commodity over a certain line, the rate is presumptively reasonable. A lower rate might enable fifteen shippers to forward the same commodity over the same line. Now if the increase in the volume of traffic makes the new rate a paying rate to the carrier, this again will be a reasonable rate. Or, the carrier might double the original rate so

that five of the original ten shippers might be no longer able to stand it, and yet the lessened service required of the carrier might make the new high rate a profitable and hence a reasonable rate conformably to Mr. Haines's specifications. Where such latitude is possible, the rule proposed becomes practically useless. One might as well define a reasonably pleasant day as one unattended by a blizzard or a cloud-burst. Having attempted a profitless task, Mr. Haines makes a bad matter worse by a futile attempt to allocate particular railroad earnings to specific transportation services. This culminates in the allegation that, in 1902, permanent improvements (\$42,000,000) and the reserve fund (\$105,000,000) were provided from "other sources" than "receipts from passenger and freight service" (p. 191).

For his lapses in the discussion of reasonable rates, Mr. Haines amply atones in his two concluding chapters. Here his tone is philosophical, and the breadth of his handling of the historical factors which have controlled our public policy in railroad matters, is most admirable. Particularly significant is his showing that the legal prohibition of pooling has had for its result the very consequences the legislators were so anxious to avoid—namely, the consolidation of great lines into greater "systems." Apprehension is now aroused over "the anticipated consequences of unrestricted combination, and it is mainly to remedy abuses of this character that there is now a popular demand for the further regulation of railroad affairs by legislation" (p. 329).

Professor Meyer's book contains in Part I. an analysis of Government fixing of railroad rates in Europe and Australia, and in Part II. an historical exposition of the setting of railroad rates in the United States. He narrows the railroad problem in this country to the question whether the Government should prescribe rates for the purpose of guaranteeing their relative reasonableness. Extortionate rates, he contends, are out of the question when the returns on actual investments in our railroads do not exceed 5.5 per cent. even in times of abounding prosperity. And secret rebates, he asserts, are in no wise rendered less likely, but rather more likely, when the rates are set by the Government instead of by the carrier. In general, this author concludes that Government-made rates arrest the decline in transportation charges, and, by gravitating towards a mileage basis, prevent the development of a volume of traffic sufficient to secure the highest attainable efficiency in railroad service. In Germany, for example, the uniform haulage charge per ton-mile apportioned trade, he thinks, in a mechanical way, and actually discriminates unjustly in favor of those districts with waterways as against those without this means of relief (p. 47). The comparative rigidity of the rates on Prussian state railways he illustrates by showing that while general prices in Germany fell between 1880 and 1899 by 17.6 per cent., railway charges fell in the same period only 14.7 per cent., while in the United States the corresponding decline was 24.3 and 41.7 per cent., respectively (p. 93). The mileage basis which Governments adopt in the setting of rates is due not so much to considerations of cost as to the necessity of having

some hard-and-fast rule of action admitting the exercise of no discretion. The significant utterance of Von Miquel (p. 456), regarding the necessity of having "the stone wall of a system" if effectual refuge was to be had from the jealousies and conflicts of local and sectional interests, points to the reason why Government-made rates must be inelastic. This same rigidity in rates is found by Professor Meyer to exist in republican France and in socialistic Australasia. In the latter country he finds the absence of the "basing-point system" responsible for the undue concentration of population and trade in Adelaide, Melbourne, and Sydney. To the same cause he attributes "the ridiculously low average of the train load in Australia—seventy-four tons in New South Wales" (p. 198).

Part II. recounts the experience of the United States in the matter of railroad rates. Professor Meyer is an uncompromising protagonist for the railroads. But if one makes allowance for this personal bias, there is much to be found in the volume of the first order of importance. Abundant illustration is afforded of the danger in every country that railway rates may become the football of sectional politics. Professor Meyer is undoubtedly right when he says (p. 278) that "in every large country there is a constant tendency toward inter-provincial protection, which is effectually counteracted only by the absence of opportunity for its realization." He is also interesting, if not absolutely conclusive, in his description and defence of the "basing-point system." The contention set up—that it creates a multitude of interior distributing points, and thus curtails what would otherwise be a monopoly of seaboard cities—is ingeniously developed. In his latter chapters, where he turns his artillery on the decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission, it must be admitted that his fire is very damaging to that body's prestige.

Notwithstanding the hard work which the volume embodies, the final verdict must be that it is the plea of the advocate, not the deliverance of the impartial judge. With all his abhorrence of Socialism, the author's temperament is emphatically that of the typical Socialist. He can see only one side of the case. He cannot always resist the temptation to fling mud. A decision as to milk rates, he remarks *obiter*, "decided how much milk from cows fed on brewery swill the people of New York must consume" (p. 385). His unfortunate allegation that the absence in Germany of group rates on milk accounted for the 14,000 cows stabled by the Von Bolle firm within the city limits of Berlin (p. 387) has proved to be wholly untrue. Moreover, one can but suspect something like chauvinism in his virtual plea for non-interference with rate-fixing when a railroad president like Judge Noyes explicitly asserts that "existing remedies afford the shipper inadequate relief from unreasonable charges"; and that "it is important that the shipper should have an opportunity of presenting the justice of the charge complained of, in an expeditious way, to a disinterested tribunal."

In the matter of remedial legislation, Judge Noyes and Mr. Haines seem to agree in upholding what may fairly be called the

railroad position. This is, in brief, that the separation of legislative and executive functions decreed by the Constitution makes it legally impossible that one and the same body shall exercise both the power to pass on the reasonableness of existing rates, and the power to set rates for the future. The former is alleged to be an exclusively judicial function; the latter, an exclusively executive or administrative function. If this contention be valid, the courts must be entrusted with some part of the work connected with rate-fixing, over and above their right to take cognizance of any rate alleged to be confiscatory. It behooves a layman to tread warily in this maze of constitutional law, but we may venture to suggest that when the Board of General Appraisers is given the power to determine the value of any import, and when no appeal may be taken from their decision to the courts, it looks very much as though what the railroad men describe as an exclusively judicial function, to wit, the determining the reasonableness of appraisal, were being performed by an administrative body. It may also be suggested that when the courts enjoin upon a carrier conformity to a certain published rate-schedule, the courts seem to be doing something akin to setting future rates. Whatever the validity of the railroads' contention in this particular matter, the ultimate settlement of our transportation problem must depend on the recognition of several cardinal truths. These are: that the same tribunal cannot act successfully in the dual rôle of inquisitor and judge; that public opinion will not rest in a system of legal appeals that so protract litigation as to defeat the ends of justice in the matter of railroad charges; and that nothing is to be gained in the long run by attempting to shelter the administrative fixation of carriers' charges from judicial review in the cold clear light of reason and of law.

GREENSLET'S LOWELL.—II.

James Russell Lowell: His Life and Work. By Ferris Greenslet. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1905.

In the course of a microscopic examination, aided, one might say, by the Röntgen rays, Mr. Greenslet shows that Mr. Lowell's prose was akin to his conversation and his letters—"struck off," as he himself says of Dryden, "at a heat, in the best mood of his talk." Many of the essays were, in fact, primarily lectures, or talks, with all the *négligé* of expression which in conversation is rather a virtue and a charm. Hence, various blemishes—looseness of structure, discursiveness at will, imperfectly coherent paragraphs, an occasional ragged or ill-sounding phrase, an occasional ebullience of metaphor. Lowell wrote too often in haste and with impatience, and he did not use the file. He permits himself to dart off in pursuit of the whim or suggestion of the moment or in search of a purple patch which he had stored from his wide reading. All these blemishes may, in fact, be detected and may bar Lowell's style from the title of Attic; but they are blemishes rather for the eye of the literary expert, and it is surprising how little they detract from the gusto and allurements of his manner for the unprofessional reader and the layman.

An old friend of Lowell's tells us that he was "as indifferent about style as a man ought to be." On the other hand, in one of his own letters, Lowell regrets that his style is becoming old-fashioned; that it is already a thing of the last century. This does not look like indifference, though the regret is certainly superfluous. There are many varieties of good prose, and Lowell's had the supreme merit of sincerity. It expressed and fitted perfectly his rich personality and many-sided endowment. If his style was not Attic (and why, indeed, should we all atticize?), it was certainly not Asiatic—nothing was there for mere decoration. His teeming metaphor and illustrations were his natural and inevitable expression. He opened his mouth, and that kind of jewels simply fell from his lips. But this easy opulence does not in the least imply entire want of discipline or indifference to his art. No one understood better than he wherein consisted the hidden harmonies of rhythmical prose—he gives a perfect definition of it in his essay on Milton's 'Areopagitica'—and no one could better illustrate these harmonies when the mood and the occasion fitted. He knew perfectly well that the diction of elevated thought and emotion is naturally rhythmical, moulding itself upon the inner waves of feeling and of thought; and the best of his later public addresses exhibit a very noble style, worthy of the weight and dignity of the matter which it clothes. The address on Democracy and the Harvard Anniversary address, which reach quite beyond the range of the mere man of letters and enshrine the ripe wisdom of the thinker and the statesman, contain sentences that remind one of the music of Sir Thomas Browne or the large discourse of Burke. They have the same grand air, and are engendered of a similar mood of reflection and lofty imagination. Such cloth of gold is not ordinarily "tailor-made" for everyday wear; but it will never go out of fashion when worn by kings. Shall we forget Bach and Beethoven and Haydn because Wagner is now all the rage?

There is another feature which is noticeable in the addresses, and, to a less extent, in the essays on literature. In his witty and amusing account of a meeting with Landor Lowell mentions an epigram which that explosive personage once hurled at Wordsworth: "One may mix as much poetry with prose as one likes—it will exhilarate the whole; but the moment one mixes a drop of prose with poetry, it precipitates the whole." This is, in the main, strikingly true. Lowell often mixed the fatal drop of disillusion with his verse; and, on the other hand, he most felicitously exhilarated his prose not only with the colors of fancy and humor, but with the gleam of poetry. In the address given before the Wordsworth Society, he speaks of Wordsworth's poetry as "the Charitreuse," dedicated to the "Genius of Solitude," to which pious souls retreat at intervals for "communion with things that are heavenly." As criticism, the thought is absolutely just and felicitous, while the paragraph which enshrines the comparison contains the material of a sonnet expressed in rhythms more exquisite than the mechanic grind of many a sonneteer. Thus does Lowell take unfair advantage of the more pedestrian

essayist, and handicap him by the charm of his genius as well as by his humor. He allures and compels the attention of his reader, whatever may be the intrinsic merits or defects of his conclusions.

As to the final value of his criticism, it must be admitted that it was in some slight measure amateurish—that it lacked a little in system, in method, and completeness; he did not always verify his memories or weigh his judgments. He was not exactly the painstaking analyst, bent on reaching the heart of his subject and reporting the *vérité vraie* in its totality. He gives us rather a series of impressions, views and observations as they come into his mind. But when all is said about method, the worth of the critic depends largely on his own mental furniture—his knowledge of art, of books, of history, of mankind, the quality of his insight and divination. We listen to him for what he has in himself. He carries away from his author no more than he brings. If we are to see things through his eyes, he must be much more than a mere cicerone. He may have all the method you please, and yet be as unprofitable as a stamp-mill without ore and water, or a ship without freight. He may be as jejune and unprofitable as the forced green fruit of many a Ph.D. in literature, constrained, poor fellow, to bring his wares prematurely to market. He has method—fresh from the laboratory, modelled on Ste.-Beuve's, and he lacks only matter and manner.

Lowell, on the contrary, carried an enormous freight of learning, of observation, and ideas, and he applied it, as a rule, with taste, good sense, keenness, and penetration. His resources were exuberant, and spent with a brilliant prodigality. His range of illustration covered nearly all that was most precious in the great literatures. Even his Greek, in which he was too modest, enabled him to divine what M. Bréal, with the wider sweep and *netteté* of his learning, has lately been enforcing—that Homer *archaizes*, and that we must not take too literally his pictures of manners and customs. All this wide realm of gold he levies on with the lightning dart of Ariel. Whatever he appropriated, he lit with the sparkle and colors of wit and fancy and imagination. Hence, if he digresses, we can follow him with cheerful resignation. The more pedestrian essayist may lead you along a straight path under a dull sky. Lowell is a companion who gives you the effect of travelling in the morning sunlight when the dew is on the grass. If you ramble a little, it is in the edifying and delectable society of a man of genius.

Notwithstanding the breadth of his culture, he had his blind sides, as Mr. Greenslet remarks, and he nursed some hearty prejudices. The superfluous heat of these makes itself felt, for example, in the essay on Carlyle and "On a Certain Condescension in Foreigners." He professed not to understand Browning; and Swinburne, for other reasons, was a pet aversion. With the French people and with a certain school of French literature he had very imperfect sympathies. Zola formed a convenient nadir of comparison—a standard dweller in the bottomless pit. For the great qualities of his genius, as well as for Swinburne's, he had really no eyes. It is easy to discern the root of this severity. He

had fixed his mind exclusively on a certain side of their defects, and, as he says in one of his letters, "A man should never write what his daughter may not read." A good rule, perhaps, if we remember that daughters are of various ages, and that in time they grow to reach years of discretion. Mrs. Browning shed tears for "la Dame aux Camélias," and Thackeray felt obliged, as an editor, to decline one of her sonnets in the interest of English *virgines puerique*. Yet one can hardly distrust Mrs. Browning's instincts in these matters. Hence we must occasionally make allowance for Lowell's chromatic aberration and for his personal equation. The Puritans did not exactly see life whole.

In his own fashion and generation, Lowell was a preacher, and kept up the traditions of his father's family; all his life long, as he himself confesses, he "could not get out of the pulpit." He keeps to the pulpit often in his poetry. It fitted his mystical tendency to profess his faith in the unanswerable formula, "I have felt"—which is, indeed, the summary of his creed nobly uttered in the closing verses of "The Cathedral." Though capable of admirable generalizations and comprehensive views in politics and social questions, he had no taste for metaphysics. The mystic in him was afraid of Darwinism and of modern Science, and so he pictured it as the black demon in the poem of "The Old Téméraire"—not imagining that the true theologian might meet the scientist halfway in the tunnel where they search and dig for a comprehensible cause of things. "I am a conservative (warranted to wash), and keep on the safe side—with God as against Evolution"—a declaration as whimsical in substance as in manner to all whose fascinating task it is to disentangle the web that is woven on the loom of Time, as well as to those who hope to find a Weaver. With this attitude it is worth while to contrast the lofty resignation of Matthew Arnold's psalm, "In utrumque paratus." So conservative was Lowell as an editor, Mr. Greenslet informs us, that he struck out of an article of Thoreau's the following sentence referring to a pine-tree: "It is as immortal as I am, and perchance will go to as high a heaven, there to tower above me still." This act of editorial despotism drove Thoreau to open rebellion, and to secession from the *Atlantic Monthly*.

Mr. Greenslet weighs accurately in his delicate balance the merits of Lowell's letters as literature. They bear comparison with the very best, though "we shall never find in them quite the edge, the unity and distinction of Gray's, of Fitzgerald's, of Stevenson's." From another point of view, they are an unusually complete revelation of an engaging and many-sided personality—an unreserved confessional which discloses only virtues and charms. For Lowell had in his soul no dark chambers and skeletons to conceal. There are some people who outstay their welcome in this world, and whose persistent survival adds inscrutableness to the mysterious ways of Providence. There are others whom we should wish to live to the age of Methuselah so that their graces and virtues may hasten the millennium; and Lowell was one of these—one who could never have been in danger of degenerating to a Struldbrug. Ariel, with a spice of Puck, adjusted to the

conscience and the backbone of a line of Puritan ancestors; a sincere democrat who was never more at home than in the society of grandees; a poet who had an abnormal passion for paying his debts; a contented bookworm and a successful statesman—these are some of the fascinating opposites which emerge and blend together in Lowell's character. He had the gifts that dazzle, the traits that allure and win, the powers that command respect and admiration. All these show in his correspondence, and account for his friendships. You find there the winking, beaded bubbles of his effervescent, irresponsible talk; you light on a letter which, for its whimsicality, might have been written by Lamb, or, again, upon a masculine declaration like this: "My opinions do not live from hand to mouth; and so long as I live, I shall be no writer of birthday odes to King Demos any more than I would to King Log; nor shall I think *our* cant any more sacred than any other." And so the reader, when he has finished the last letter, feels that he has parted from a friend; he renews that old sense of bewilderment at the wastefulness of Nature, which carelessly deflowers and unmakes a growth so rare and beautiful and strong. In this feeling, stranger though he be, he will have rendered precisely that tribute which Lowell always craved: "I would rather be loved than anything else in the world."

FURNITURE OF WINDSOR CASTLE.

The Furniture of Windsor Castle. By Guy Francis Laking, M.V.O., F.S.A., Keeper of the King's Armory. Published by Command of his Majesty King Edward VII. London: Bradbury, Agnew & Co.; New York: Dutton. 1905. Pp. xx., 200; also 47 plates.

This book is a very handsome quarto, and there are certain indications that it forms part of a series, proposed or already begun. Thus, on the bastard title is printed in red "The Royal Collection," this being quite separate from the title of the book proper. In another place there is mention, as if it already existed, of a book on the armor of the royal collection. Again, it is announced in the introduction that the "splendid clocks, the interesting series of bronzes, the fine porcelain, and the decorative objects generally will be dealt with in forthcoming volumes." It would seem, then, that everything in the Windsor collection, except the paintings and statuary, is to be described in the series of books which will be of value for their plates at least, if for no other reason. It is quite well known that there is much magnificent porcelain at Windsor, and also well known that it is almost impossible to get sight of it—wholly impossible to study it with any thoroughness. The castle is essentially a residence. No pains have been taken to separate from the private apartments those halls and corridors which must of necessity contain the greater part of the splendid royal collections. You can get admission to the private dining-room of the sovereign almost as easily as you can to the great corridors lighted from the court, in which are arranged cabinets full of as fine portable objects of decorative design as there are in the world.

Now we have in the book under considera-

tion nearly fifty separate pieces of furniture of very great beauty, and presented in excellent photogravures of delicate tint. With this presentation the only not favorable comment that one can make is that nearly every piece is presented so exactly in front face that appearance of thickness, depth, solidity—what you will—has been taken from them. Once in a while, as in Plate 28, the sideboard is so open, with its supporting feet and braces so plainly visible in perspective, that we understand the piece to be thirty inches deep, more or less; but that plate is immediately followed by a great wardrobe of seventeenth-century French work—a splendid piece of the early style of Louis XIV., as to which there is no such certainty. It might be a mere pair of doors pinned against the wall but for the suggestion of a retreating member at the top. The purpose of this choice of a straight front view is undoubtedly to show in great perfection the minute detail of these pieces; and in the case of that very wardrobe, Plate 20, it is so that the author and publishers would proceed in the case of a book prepared for the daily use of the workshop. Books are made in great abundance and at great cost for the obvious and confessed purpose of furnishing designs which can be readily appropriated, and these designs are given as much “in elevation” as possible, in order that the dividers and the scale of the draughtsman may be applied directly to the piece, and the act of “conveying” the design may be simplified. But why the compiler of such a stately publication as this should have failed to see, in his magnificent *armoires* and *commodes*, objects having thickness or depth, as well as height and width, it is hard to understand. It is only fair to say, however, that the magnificent French book dealing with the furniture in the Louvre and published about 1901 gives the greater number of its splendid specimens in this same precise and non-descriptive way.

The plates and the text of the Windsor book are divided into groups. Thus, furniture, English and Continental, is kept apart from French furniture, and the first division is of this non-French work from 1640 to 1700, the second of English furniture of the eighteenth century; the third, of that of the nineteenth. One chapter with three plates is devoted to tapestried hangings, four chapters are devoted to French furniture of the times of Louis XIV., XV., XVI., the nineteenth century, and so on. There is, however, no very exact classification. Thus, Plate 13 (inserted curiously out of its numerical order) is devoted to the throne of the King of Kandy, which, although said to be partly Dutch in its conception, is yet wholly Oriental in the enrichment. It is covered with plates of pure gold and of silver-gilt, embossed and chiselled in the most elaborate fashion; the arms are wrought into the semblance of grotesque lions, and a prodigious frieze of amethyst “crystals” and white sapphires adorns the back, while other amethysts serve as eyes for the savage creatures, and “a large pear-shaped white sapphire” is set in the back just above the head of the occupant of the throne. These explanations come from the description at page 14, where also the dimensions are given, the place of manufacture, and the time and place of seizure by the British forces. And in the way of

further study of Oriental art, though of a more grave and significant character, Plates 17, 18, and 21 present three very fine Japanese lacquer cabinets, which are mounted on very respectable and even appropriate stands of European make. These Oriental pieces have escaped the destructive repair which other parts of the collection have undergone, as the text confesses.

Plates 31 and 42 represent a class well known to those who have studied French furniture of the eighteenth century as made up in Europe from panels and planks adorned with Japanese lacquer-work of the richest sort, and much good taste is shown in such pieces—more than would have been thought possible—in an accommodation of the black and gold or dull green and gold landscape decoration of the surface to the less refined European adornment. Plate 39 is a beautiful sideboard of the style of Louis XVI., with lacquered panels of exquisite character. We note three other pieces of similar character, in which what are more probably Chinese panels are inserted in a European-made frame.

Of European design unmodified by strange influences the most important piece would seem to be the ebony cabinet in Plate 1, and the most historical piece King William the Third's writing-table shown in Plate 8; though one learns with regret that this table had almost gone to pieces from neglect and careless handling, and that a very complete overhauling was necessary not long ago. Its whole surface is inlaid with marquetry of a very delicate sort, and it bears a cipher of the combined initials of William III. and Mary II., though this is not seen in the plate. There are several pieces of silver furniture presented to William and Mary by the citizens of London or by special bodies of merchants and the like, and some of them are of great beauty. Then there are Boulle cabinets and sideboards, some of them announced as of English work made under the influence of André Charles Boulle and his associates; and one piece at least, a really splendid object, from the great master's workshop. A sideboard announced as English is itself a wonderfully delicate specimen of the famous inlay, introduced by Boulle, of tortoise shell and sheet metal. There are two or three pieces of Louis Sixteenth furniture, in addition to those with Japanese ornamentation, as explained above. A writing table, Plate 35, is a beautiful piece of marquetry; a cabinet, Plate 45, is one of the more pompous pieces of the revived classic style, and another cabinet, Plate 40, is as fine in detail, and contains magnificent plaques of painted porcelain from Sèvres. A similar piece is shown in Plate 41, and the long description of this includes the statement that it was purchased in 1827 for two hundred and ten pounds sterling. It would be a pleasure to see it at auction in Paris to-day; and it would be dangerous betting that it would reach a lower price than a hundred thousand francs; so incredibly great has been the increase in money value of fine pieces of this epoch.

Only three tapestries are given, but those three are fine, and finely reproduced in the photogravures. One is Flemish, one is English of the seventeenth century and of the Mortlake works, and the third is a really splendid piece of Gobelins, “Jason Sowing the Dragon's Teeth,” one of a set of six.

In this way the book affords a museum of splendid furniture which, even without printed descriptions or other assistance to the student, would have its unquestioned value. The text exists, however, and, although it claims no great learning and displays no great acumen in the description of the pieces, it still gives information that is worth having. The author, not of necessity and because of his post a judge of works of decorative art, goes afield sometimes to gather information concerning the pieces in his charge, and is often right and instructive to his readers, though again he makes odd mistakes. On page 104 there is an effort made to explain Boulle work, that is, the famous inlay process, and the puzzling terms connected with it are explained without error and with sufficient fulness. Of the mistakes, it is hardly worth while treating at length. What is really noticeable in the text is the description of the extraordinary wastefulness that has marked the treatment of the precious contents of Windsor Castle from the first, almost down to the present day. This need surprise no one. What has been said of the very domestic character of the English royal residence accounts for much of it. The succeeding sovereigns or their lord chamberlains, or their mistresses of the robes, or their stewards, have felt free to refurnish in the newest style, and the older pieces have been stored away in cellars or garrets; or, in a thousand unrecorded cases, have been simply carried off. It is probably considered no theft to appropriate a disused and perhaps defaced piece of furniture found in a royal store-room. Accordingly, it appears that not one piece of furniture, of hangings, metal-work, or the like, which was mentioned in the inventory of 1547, in the reign of Edward VI., is now to be found. Again, we are told in the introduction, that “no true Jacobean furniture” exists in Windsor Castle; and it appears that by this is meant furniture of the reign of James I., as is technically correct. Moreover, though King George IV. (1820-1830) had careful inventories made of the contents of this and the other royal residences, the greatest difficulty is now experienced in identifying the various objects mentioned. It appears, too, that nearly £180,000 were spent, in 1830, for renovating these and other royal possessions; and that alterations of the most serious description were made in very many important pieces—“in almost every piece,” says our author. It is some slight consolation to be told that “some of the finest of the later French examples escaped the general renovation.”

It is evident, then, that Windsor Castle is not a museum of works of art in the strictest sense. There has been too much repairing and remaking, and the placing of marble slabs on pieces never intended to receive them, and the planing off of rude ancient paintings on the insides of doors to replace them with pasted paper of a crudely colored sort. It follows that if the contents of Windsor Castle were offered, *en bloc*, to the Victoria and Albert Museum, that would probably happen which would certainly happen if they came into non-English hands—they would be accepted with the proviso that minute examination and unlimited overhauling should be allowed. Your Jacobean cabinet would

need be looked at very closely before it was labelled or catalogued in accordance with the first description.

Heretics. By G. K. Chesterton. John Lane Co. 1905.

A heretic, if we go back to etymology, is really only a man who makes a choice. The word acquired its present coloring in the days when those who controlled the thoughts and beliefs of men admitted no power of choice. Not to conform was to be persecuted in this world, and damned in the next. But since nonconformity was in that remote past a sign of exceptional intelligence, however sinfully applied, the modern man who thoughtlessly rejects the fetters of doctrine calls himself a heretic with a silly, deprecating smile, as though the name had not long ago lost all its distinction. If you want to be really distinguished in these days you will be doctrinal. For that you will need all your courage and a rare strength. It has always been the peculiar distinction of Mr. Chesterton's position. He goes forth to war, not for any new-fangled counsel of perfection of freedom of will, but for the good old commonplaces, the fruit of the accumulated wisdom of the ages. Any one can champion a Superman, for his theory will never be put to the test of practice; or the advantages of cosmopolitanism, since we all remain firmly planted in our limited parochial interests and shall so remain. But it takes real eloquence to argue that we had better ignore Irish paganism and keep Christmas, thankful that we have a real live tradition no more vulgar in the fashion of its observance to-day than the Olympian Games were vulgar in the sixth and fifth centuries B. C.

The essential weakness of the present age, as Mr. Chesterton envisages it, is really nothing else than that which distressed Socrates in fifth-century Athens. Everywhere he sees, as Socrates and Plato saw, men trying to secure for themselves and their children something whose good they cannot define.

"The modern man says, 'Away with your old moral formulæ; I am for progress.' This, logically stated, means, 'Let us not settle what is good; but let us settle whether we are getting more of it.' He says, 'Neither in religion nor morality, my friend, lie the hopes of the race, but in education.' This, clearly expressed, means, 'We cannot decide what is good, but let us give it to our children.' . . . I see that the men who killed each other about the orthodoxy of the Homocousion were far more sensible than the people who are quarrelling about the Education Act. For the Christian dogmatists were trying to establish a reign of holiness, and trying to get defined first of all what was really holy. But our modern educationists are trying to bring about a religious liberty without attempting to settle what is religion or what is liberty. If the old priests forced a statement on mankind, at least they previously took some trouble to make it lucid. It has been left for the modern mobs of Anglicans and Nonconformists to persecute for a doctrine without even stating it. . . . I revert to the doctrinal methods of the thirteenth century, inspired by the general hope of getting something done."

Heterodoxy has always meant simply "the other man's doxy," and Mr. Chesterton's heretics are a few distinguished contemporaries who do not agree with him as to fundamentals. First, Mr. Kipling. His peculiar self-deception, says Mr. Chester-

ton, lies in thinking that he is writing for the glory of militarism, when what he really admires is discipline, the sort of organization that is quite as admirable in a department store as in the War Office or a camp. Mr. Kipling, then, if he really knew himself, would see that it would be more logical to stick to the praise of the engine-room or works of irrigation than to exhaust his vocabulary in glorifying the truest possible sign of the decadence of his nation, its militarism, its dependence on armies and the most modern make of gun instead of on the courage of every individual citizen. Another weakness is his cosmopolitanism. He "thinks of England as a place." He knows it "as an intelligent English gentleman knows Venice." But he has not "the patience to become part of anything. . . . And under all this vast illusion of the cosmopolitan planer, with its empires and its Reuter's Agency, the real life of man goes on concerned with this tree or that temple, totally uncomprehended, totally untouched."

But it is Mr. Shaw who is the most perfect type of a self-deluded heretic; an unusual type in that he is thoroughly consistent. In fact, we know what Mr. Shaw will be saying thirty years hence much better than we know what any Cabinet Minister will be saying thirty years hence. His strong point is his readiness to "apply the Shaw test rapidly and rigorously to everything that happens in heaven or earth." His weakness is that he fails to see things as they are because he is blinded by the light of an impossible ideal, the Superman. He has never seen things as they are, because "this secret ideal has withered all the things of this world." "It is not seeing things as they are to imagine a demigod of infinite mental clarity, who may or may not appear in the latter days of the earth, and then to see all men as idiots." For it is the ordinary man, seen as he is, who is really the prodigy, "a wonderful and unnerving matter." Mr. Shaw, asking for a new kind of man, is like a nurse who has tried a rather bitter food for some years on a baby, and, on discovering that it is not suitable, does not throw away the food and demand a new food, but throws away the baby and asks for a new baby. There has been no better or more lucid criticism of Mr. Shaw than these few pages, in which the very man who, in his 'Quintessence of Ibsenism,' forbade men to have ideals, because they would blind them to the particular case, is shown to be unable to see men as they are because he is always comparing humanity with what is not human, a monster from Mars or the Wise Man of the Stoics or the Economic Man of the Fabians.

It is mainly Mr. Shaw's lack of humility that prevents his proper appreciation of man as he is. Mr. H. G. Wells, another heretic, is humble with "the clear personal simplicity of the old world of science." Like Mr. Chesterton, he has come to "the most dreadful conclusion: that a literary man can come to—the conclusion that the ordinary view is the right one." His weakness is common to all who frame Utopias—an indifference to human psychology. In his ideal State he ignores the human soul as Plato ignored it in his 'Republic,' though Plato did not at any rate make the mistake of supposing that pure cosmopolitanism was possible for the race. In the case of Mr. Wells and his philosophy Mr. Chester-

ton again shows his own affinity to the Platonists in a long and careful refutation of Mr. Wells's assertion of a Heraclitean flux. Curious indeed that, after so many battles lost and won in the field of philosophic discussion, it should be possible for a Mr. Wells gravely to repeat the doctrine that All things are in a state of flux, and for a Mr. Chesterton to set himself soberly to prove that "it cannot be true that there is nothing abiding in what we know."

As a critic, not only of heretics but of various aspects and relations of life discussed in this volume, when he has finished off the heretics, Mr. Chesterton shows a definite advance in clearness and force. One fault is thrust on him by his peculiar championship of the doctrinal, an excessive use of those "paradoxes that sit by the springs of truth." One is driven to be startling as well as brave when one is asserting that two and two do not make five. He repeats himself with a fine carelessness, as though, having thought of a good illustration, one could not do better than go on using it; a practice for which there is much to be said in these days when every writer prides himself on a cheap variety of phrase and cannot venture to use so much as the same word twice in a sentence. No one can forecast Mr. Chesterton's future as a critic, and it would not surprise us if it should prove that the true vocation of all this abundant energy is something quite different from setting his contemporaries straight. Meanwhile he knows how to make men stop and look, not at some new and striking theory, like Mr. Shaw (that is easy enough), but at the more settled, more rigid views that are out of date, if perchance they may not, after all, be suited for yet another generation's wear. This is a restful thought at a time when we have been assured by one of the most brilliant of living writers that no truth, no moral generalization, should be allowed to live for more than twenty years. After that it is diseased, decayed, and should be discarded and replaced, which is "progress."

My Sixty Years on the Plains: Trapping, Trading, and Indian Fighting. By W. T. Hamilton. New York: Forest and Stream Publishing Co. 1905.

Indian fighting has always been so obvious and facile a field for the sensational newspaper romancer that one picks up anything new on the subject with a justifiable feeling of suspicion. In the narrative of "Bill Hamilton," however, we have a document of real significance. Born in the Cheviot Hills in 1823, the casting vote of his uncle, two years later, turned him with a company of twenty-five men toward America instead of India, to which twelve of the party had wished to go. The family finally settled in St. Louis, where the son received five years of schooling, but suffered seriously from chills and fever, so common a scourge along the river valleys of the Middle West in the early days. In his twentieth year a physician's advice started him over the plains with a party of independent hunters and trappers. The programme called for a year of this life, but the excitement of it fell in too harmoniously with young Hamilton's temperament ever to allow a return to the habits of a more settled civilization. As Indian

fighter, trapper, and trader his years have been spent, and at the advanced age of eighty-three he tells the reader that it is still his habit to spend a portion of each year trapping in the mountains, "thankful that he can still enjoy and appreciate the wonderful beauties of nature."

The alert reader, however, soon discovers that the fundamental motive does not lie in the enjoyment and appreciation of nature as these words are generally understood. Among those of his kind he would probably admit that to his own eyes an Indian's scalp was the fairest flower; his hands had ever plucked; and it is as a psychological study of the attitude of the early trappers and traders toward the Indians that the book has its chief value. To Mr. Hamilton the Easterner, or Westerner either, who would halt at scalping a slain Indian or burning a heap of Indian bodies, as a warning to others unfortunately still living, is simply a weakling whose good opinion of his book or its author is not of sufficient importance to warrant concealment of the facts. And as he does not conceal, neither (apparently) does he exaggerate. The good Indian, in his creed, was the Indian whose valuation of his hunting grounds was not high enough to cause him to object to the presence of the paleface with his traps and guns, and who would raise no troublesome question, either of fact or of ethics, over the purchase of a ten-dollar skin for some trinket worth hardly as many cents. Of course, questions of freight and life insurance may fairly be considered to enter prominently into merchandise of this sort, but our author specifically asserts that over \$7,000 worth of marten skins could be carried out of the wilderness on a single pack-horse, and as for danger to life the Indian certainly had the bad end of the bargain. In one chapter we have an amusing description (written in perfect gravity, however), of the versatile mendacity with which "Bill Williams," leader of Mr. Hamilton's party, deluded and defrauded another white trader. As he knew Williams to be "the soul of honor," he ventured to ask for an explanation. "Diplomacy," was the laconic reply. It was sufficient for Mr. Hamilton, and long years of observation have convinced him that honorable merchants in general follow the same tactics.

Mr. Hamilton has nothing but contempt for alleged Indian prowess. The free white trapper could outclass him at every point at which the two came into conflict, and the end of the struggle was predestined from the beginning. The impenetrability of such a mind to any idea of Indian rights as against a white man is complete and unalterable. The believer in such rights has taken himself out of the realm of reality, he would say, and is a negligible quantity; or, to convey the thought in more familiar language, he would call him a d—d fool. From this type of man the Indian of the Western plains and mountains largely formed his idea of the white intruder, and that is why so many names of Indian tribes marked upon the atlases of fifty years ago no longer represent anything more tangible than the mouldering flesh and bones which have gone into the fertilization of the fields of the Western farmer of to-day. We may readily admire Hamilton's energy and resourcefulness, and admit that the harm was done, perhaps irreparably, before

he came upon the scene; but it would be a pretty serious indictment of civilization to hold that there was not at the outset a less bloody possibility—a possibility which would have put energy and resourcefulness into the task of getting civilization into the Indian's heart and brain, rather than that of getting the scalp from his head.

James Macpherson. By J. S. Smart. London: David Nutt. 1905.

Voluminous as the literature of Ossianic controversy already is, Mr. Smart has fully justified himself for adding one book more to it. His survey of the subject is in many respects the best we remember to have seen. In a sense, his work contains nothing new, and he does not make for it any claim of originality. The opinions he sets forth about the writings and the puzzling career of James Macpherson rest almost wholly on the investigations of other scholars, to whom full credit is given. But Mr. Smart has mastered the material so well and shown so good a sense of its significance that his book passes out of the class of mere second-hand compilations, and becomes an instructive essay in the literary history of the eighteenth century. It will serve good purpose, we may hope, in disseminating sound doctrine on the subject with which it deals. For although Celtic scholars are now in substantial agreement concerning the nature of Macpherson's Ossianic poems, there is still much misapprehension about them in the minds of others, and Mr. Smart's book will doubtless be read by many who would never consult the notes in J. F. Campbell's 'Leabhar na Feinne,' or find their way to the articles of Dr. Macbain, Professor Stern, and Mr. Alfred Nutt.

So long as Ossianic discussion turned largely on the character and motives of Macpherson and his various friends and sponsors, there was little hope of reaching any satisfactory agreement. Men were too likely to take sides according as they were by temperament adherents of Macpherson or of Dr. Johnson. Still more fruitless were the arguments about the nature of primitive epics and the long patriotic wrangle about the nationality of Ossian, whether he was a Scottish or an Irish Gael. The only secure results, as Mr. Smart shows, have been obtained by comparing Macpherson's productions with the native poetry in mediæval and modern Gaelic, of which a large quantity has become accessible in the last generation. The result of this comparison has been to convince scholars that Macpherson's Gaelic is modern and sometimes bad, and that the metrical form of his pieces is utterly unlike that of the genuine Ossianic poems. Incidental evidence makes it practically certain that his Gaelic version was translated from the English of which it purported to be the original. The English "Ossian," in turn, was only slightly dependent for style or substance on the native ballads, and was about as much the work of Macpherson as 'Paradise Lost' was the work of Milton.

Mr. Smart not only gives an admirable statement of the chief arguments which have led scholars to these conclusions, but he also discusses their wider bearings. It is obvious that, with the English Ossian

thus disposed of, much that has been written about the Celtic genius has ceased to apply. Matthew Arnold's famous essay was not entirely unaffected by the false, or at least one-sided, conception of Celticism to which Macpherson gave rise, and the tradition has been maintained by a series of Anglo-Celtic writers. Mr. Smart comments very sensibly on this tendency, and argues for a truer and more complete characterization of Celtic literature such as has been made easier in recent times by the publication of great numbers of native monuments of every period. His critical observations appear to us to be generally sound. He is also right, in our opinion, in taking issue with some of the ethnological doctrine promulgated by Renan and Arnold in their essays on the Celts.

Chopin, As Revealed by Extracts from his Diary. By Count Tarnowski. Translated by Natalie Janotha. Scribners. 1906.

George Sand et sa fille: d'après leur Correspondance inédite. Par S. Rocheblave. Paris: Calmann-Lévy.

These two books, of very unequal merit, give us the opposite sides of the miserable quarrel that parted George Sand and Chopin shortly before the composer's death. It is not easy to mete out even justice to the great French novelist, nor does either of these books attain that end; her defender claims too much, her accuser is that and nothing more. After all, the strongest chord of her life was her marvellous power of work and unsparing artistic conscience; its ever pressing spur was the constant necessity of earning money. Who can forget De Goncourt's delightful, if unsympathetic, picture of the eminent authoress at Nohant, finishing a novel at 2:30 A. M., and, without a pause, taking up a fresh sheet to start a new one? That was her life, and in it De Musset, Chopin, even her children Maurice and Solange, were only incidents. That she tired of Chopin, that she got rid of him, that she quarrelled with him, is true; but that she acted as a monster does not in the least follow. In her letters to Solange her consciousness of innocence is transparent. After the return from Majorca, for seven years she was Chopin's nurse, and only his nurse. The post was arduous, for it is beyond question that the Polish composer was of the most fretful and trying temperament. And when the break finally came, it is clear from the letters now printed by M. Rocheblave that it was owing to Chopin's interfering in the matter of the marriage of Solange to the sculptor Clésinger. Chopin was never in the secret of the circumstances that made George Sand, with perfect justification, take up an attitude distinctly hostile to Clésinger; and she, determined to defend the sanctity of her literary laboratory at Nohant, decided to have done with his interference.

Count Tarnowski's book is extremely slight; such new matter of Chopin as it offers is scrappy and not satisfactorily presented; his own comments disclose no extensive knowledge of his subject. On the other hand, M. Rocheblave gives us a skillful piece of bookmaking. The editing is restrained, even to the verge of prudishness. Many of George Sand's letters here given for the first time are well worth

reading. One extract only can be indulged in, one in which she sums up, precisely and delightfully, her whole attitude towards her wayward Solange. She writes to her reprovingly in June, 1858:

"Mais le beau Paris de Troie, aux cheveux fusés, passe, et te voilà partie pour le pays des flûtes, des rubans et des grelots, affaissant des airs de don Juan femelle, et disant avec de grands éclats de rire: 'Mon Dieu, que j'étais bête, hier, d'être bonne et raisonnable!' Pourquoi tout cela? Je l'ai dit souvent: Je l'ai mise au monde, je l'ai nourrie, fouettée, adorée, gâtée, grondée, punie, pardonnée; et avec tout cela je ne la connais pas du tout, ne pouvant jamais deviner ni comprendre pourquoi elle fait ou veut faire telle ou telle chose qui pour moi n'a pas sa raison d'être."

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

American History in Literature. Compiled by Martha A. L. Lane and Mabel Hill. Boston: Ginn & Co. 50 cents.
Barnes-Grundy, Mabel. Hazel of Heatherland. The Baker & Taylor Co. \$1.50.
California: The Writings of Eliza A. Otis: Poetry and Prose. Los Angeles: The Times-Mirror Co.
Deutsches Liederbuch für Amerikanische Studenten. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.
Eyre, Archibald. The Girl in Waiting. Boston: John W. Luce & Co.
Gapon, Father George. The Story of My Life. Dutton. \$3 net.
Hall, Angelo. Sermons and Poems. Baltimore: The Friedenwald Co.
Justice for the Russian Jew. J. S. Ogilvie Publishing Co.
King, W. L. Mackenzie. The Secret of Heroism. Fleming H. Revell Co. \$1 net.
Lincoln, Abraham. Complete Works of. Edited by John G. Nicolay and John Hay. Vols. I. and II. Francis D. Tandy Co.
Moffatt, James. Literary Illustrations of the Bible: Ecclesiastes.—Saint Mark. A. C. Armstrong & Son.

Oppenheim, L. International Law. Vol. II.: War and Neutrality. Longmans.
Poe, Edgar Allan. Selected Poems and Tales of. Edited by Charles M. Graves. Silver, Burdett & Co.
Potter, Margaret. The Genius. Harpers. \$1.50.
Rickert, Edith. Folly. The Baker & Taylor Co.
Roberts, Morley. The Idlers. Boston: L. C. Page & Co. \$1.50.
Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library. Vol. II. By Moriz Winternitz and Arthur B. Keith. Henry Frowde. 25s. net.
Sedgwick, Anne Douglas. The Shadow of Life. Century Co. \$1.50.
Shuckburgh, E. S. Greece to A. D. 14. Putnams.
Simpson, Percy. Scenes from Old Playbooks. Henry Frowde.
Thorndike, Edward L. The Principles of Teaching. A. G. Sells.
Traubel, Horace. With Walt Whitman in Camden. Boston: Small, Maynard & Co.
Unwin, A. Harold. Future Forest Trees. A. Wessels Co. \$2.25 net.
Vachell, Horace A. The Hill. Dodd, Mead & Co. \$1.50.
Warren, F. D. Reinforced Concrete. D. Van Nostrand Co. \$2.50 net.

NOTEWORTHY BOOKS

Sociology, History, &c.

HALL'S IMMIGRATION, and its effects upon the United States. By the secretary of the Immigration Restriction League. In *American Public Problems*. Ed. by R. C. Ringwalt. \$1.50.*

MERRIAM'S NEGRO AND THE NATION. Probably the first complete history of the Negro in relation to our politics. \$1.75.*

STUDIES IN AMERICAN TRADES-UNIONISM. Ed. by J. H. Hollander and by G. E. Barnett. 8vo. \$2.75.*

WILLIS' OUR PHILIPPINE PROBLEM. *The Springfield Republican* calls it "Able, honest, and sincere," and adds "no other book contains more solid truth." \$1.50.*

WOODS' HEREDITY IN ROYALTY. Based on a consideration of some 3,300 persons. With over 100 portraits \$3.*

WALLACE'S RUSSIA REVISED AND UP TO DATE. "In the same class as Mr. Bryce's 'American Commonwealth.'" *London Times*. (\$5 retail.)

Shakespeare

STOPFORD BROOKE ON TEN PLAYS OF SHAKESPEARE. \$2.25*

Nature

DR. CURTIS'S NATURE AND HEALTH. Informal papers on eating, drugging for delectation, seeing, hearing, clothing, bathing, disinfecting, exercising the body, exercising the mind, sleeping and waking, working and playing, living and dying, etc. \$1.25.*

CHAMBERLIN AND SALISBURY'S GEOLOGY, VOL. II. and III. Not sold separately. With some 575 illustrations. \$8 net.

LANKESTER'S EXTINCT ANIMALS. *The Tribune* says: "Opens up a world of new interest * * * popular rather than technical." (Profusely illustrated. \$1.75.*)

THE OPEN ROAD. Ed. by E. V. Lucas. 125 poems of out-door life by 60 authors. Flexible covers, 16mo. \$1.50.

*Add 10 per cent of price for postage.



HENRY HOLT & CO
29 WEST 23RD ST. NEW YORK

THE BURROWS BROTHERS COMPANY
OF CLEVELAND, OHIO

are the leading booksellers in the United States along certain lines. They issue a Catalog of Rare Volumes monthly, and this, together with their List of Publications devoted to American History, will be SENT FREE to any one making the request.

Importing Notice

We beg to announce that we have greatly extended our facilities for the importation of English books, so that we now are equipped to fill orders of this sort with the greatest efficiency and intelligence.

Promptness, good service and low prices will rule in this department, as they do in all our business.

THE BAKER & TAYLOR CO.

WHOLESALE BOOKSELLERS,

33-37 E. 17th St., Union Sq. North, New York

With 19 Plates and 637 Illustrations in the Text. Imperial 8vo. \$6.00 net

Steam Turbines

Their Development, Styles of Build, Construction, and Uses. By WILHELM GENTSCH, Kaiserl. Regierungsrat und Mitglied des Patentamts. Translated from the German by ARTHUR R. LIDDELL.

* * * Prospectus with specimen pages sent upon request.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO., New York

The Astor Edition
of Poets

is the best for schools and colleges. 93 vols. List price, 60c. per vol. (price to schools 40c.).

SEND FOR LIST.

Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., New York



Sally Wister's Journal

This famous book, the real diary of a real girl of 1777, gives us a new view of the Revolutionary war. Her flirtations with Washington's officers are told to her girl friend with the most charming freedom. Beautifully illustrated. A capital gift-book. \$2 postpaid, or at bookstores.

FERRIS & LEACH, Pubs., Phila.

F. W. CHRISTERN

(DYRSSEN & PFEIFFER, Successors)

16 West 33d St., opposite the "Waldorf," New York, Importers of Foreign Books, Agents for the leading Paris Publishers, Tauchnitz's British authors, Teubner's Greek and Latin Classics. Catalogue of stock mailed on demand. New books received from Paris and Leipzig as soon as issued.

THE BEST ANIMAL STORY.

RED FOX: RED FOX:

By CHARLES G. D. ROBERTS

Author of "The Heart of the Ancient Wood," "The Kindred of the Wild," etc.

In press for early publication

From a
College Window

By ARTHUR C. BENSON

Fellow of "Magdalene College," Cambridge.

Crown 8vo. \$1.25 net.

A collection of familiar essays, in which the reader is brought under the spell of a singularly interesting and attractive personality. The book is a frank outpouring of the author's intimate thoughts, a frank expression of what he prizes in life and what he expects from life. Mr. Benson's papers are characterized by the intimacy of self-revelation and allusiveness and sense of overflow that belong to the familiar essay at its best.

G. P. Putnam's Sons, 27 & 29 West 23d St., N. Y.

"Rich in moral suggestiveness."—*London Standard*.

IN PERIL OF CHANGE

Essays Written in Time of Tranquillity

By C. F. G. MASTERMAN, M. P.

Literary Editor London Daily News.

331 pp. \$1.50 net; postage 12c. At booksellers, or

B. W. HUEBSCH - - New York

Beethoven—Franklin—Rousseau:

KRUELL'S Portraits, wood-engraved in the highest manner of the art and printed on Japan paper, size 9x11 inches, market price Twenty Dollars each, now offered at half rate to subscribers on the books of the *Nation*, and sent, carriage free, on receipt of Ten Dollars.—Address

PUBLISHER OF THE NATION, New York.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

Says that Owen Wister's Life of Gen. Grant in the Beacon Biographies "is the best brief biography ever written of any prominent American." Every one should read it. Postpaid 75 cts.

SMALL, MAYNARD & COMPANY

31 Arrow Street Cambridge, Mass.

LITERARY CRITICISM

Of English and American Authors.

1880 to 1905. In eight royal 8vo volumes, 6,000 pages. Descriptive matter and specimen pages on request.

MOULTON PUBLISHING CO., Buffalo, New York

THE MUSES LIBRARY

50 cents per volume. List on application.

E. P. DUTTON & CO., - - NEW YORK

DEFINITE OFFERS OF BOOKS, and Periodicals collected by

A. S. CLARE, Peekskill, N. Y.